This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 07479477 1

NATURAL HISTORY

AND

OTHER SUBJECTS.

13, 126, 127

CONTRIBUTIONS

TO

NATURAL HISTORY,

AND

PAPERS ON OTHER SUBJECTS.

By JAMES SIMSON.

" . . . . Beware
Of entrance to a quarrel; but, being in,
Bear it, that the opposer may beware of thee.
. . . .
This above all,—to thine ownself be true."

SHAKSPEARE.

NEW YORK:
JAMES MILLER, PUBLISHER,
779 BROADWAY.
1878.

All rights reserved.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
91331
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1897.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by
JAMES SIMSON,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Re-entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1878, by
JAMES SIMSON,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

EDWARD O. JENKINS' PRINT,
20 *North William Street, New York.*

INTRODUCTION.

THE following *Contributions* to *Land and Water* are, I think, too interesting and valuable to the lovers of natural history to be allowed to remain in the columns of a newspaper.* There are too few of them to make a volume, and so are published in this form.† I would have added to them but for the difficulty in finding subjects, or leisure to develop them, that have not been treated before, or treated in such a way as to require to be corrected, and placed on another and more permanent foundation than heretofore. Intelligent and ingenious people generally prefer to see an idea started and elucidated, with all the circumstances attending it—as some enjoy the breaking away of a fox, and being well up with the hounds, and in at the death—rather than have the dry result of an inquiry stated to them; for then they become, as it were, investigators along with him who makes it, while the particulars give them detailed and positive evidence of the conclusions arrived at. For my part, I consider the testimony to prove the leading fact set forth in these *Contributions* so complete, that nothing could be added to it; although it would be very interesting to have a careful examination of the anatomy of the Snake, to ascertain the physical peculiarities connected with the phenomenon described.

What I have said on the subject of snakes swallowing their young applies to everything connected with natural history, viz: that it "should be settled by evidence, as a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions or theories not being allowed to form part of the testimony" (p. 28). In other words, the writer should be placed in the witness-box, and severely cross-questioned as to his facts, systems and theories; or place himself there, and be his own examiner. In these days, on the subject of natural history among others, we stand greatly

* Such of these *Contributions* as were printed in *Land and Water* have a note giving the date of publication; the others, with only one date attached, were returned by request.

† It was originally intended to print these in the form of a pamphlet.

in need of Bacon's philosophy, which might be called common sense systematized and refined, having for its object the finding of facts, and tracing them to their roots, or from their roots through their various ramifications; which constitute the philosophy of any question. I am well aware of the difficulties attending the reception of new facts and ideas, which are apt to bewilder and bore people whose *judgments* have never been really cultivated. The general and sometimes almost involuntary aversion to receive them is somewhat like the resistance made to a suit at law to dispossess people of their properties, to say nothing of the timidity of many to commit themselves to what might be, or what might be held by the public to be, "vulgar errors;" but that is presumed, by the "force of truth," sooner or later to disappear.

It is wonderful how much the Serpent is mixed up with the Old and New Testament histories, and how little is known about it; and it would be remarkable if no meaning could be attached to the Scriptural allusions to it, or that no interest should be felt in regard to it. However odious the reptile is held to be, it wonderfully rivets the attention of people meeting it, and it is either timidly avoided or savagely killed. Many of them are not only harmless, but of great use to the farmer in clearing his fields of mice and other vermin; but some of the venomous kinds are so dangerous, that a person bitten by them might as well, in some instances, lay himself down and die, like a poisoned rat in its hole. It is one of the mysteries of nature why some snakes should be poisonous and others harmless, when the former could apparently serve the end for which it was created without its venomous peculiarity. The leading traits in the natural history of the Snake are incidentally illustrated in the present *Contributions.*

The *Papers on Other Subjects* were added after the above was written.

NEW YORK, *1st September*, 1874.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

VIPERS AND SNAKES GENERALLY, ... 7
WHITE OF SELBORNE ON THE VIPER, ... 10
WHITE OF SELBORNE ON SNAKES, ... 17
SNAKES SWALLOWING THEIR YOUNG, ... 23
SNAKES SWALLOWING THEIR YOUNG, ... 25
SNAKES CHARMING BIRDS, ... 30
MR. FRANK BUCKLAND ON ENGLISH SNAKES, ... 31
MR. GOSSE ON THE JAMAICA BOA SWALLOWING HER YOUNG, . 33
AMERICAN SNAKES, ... 36
AMERICAN SCIENCE CONVENTION ON SNAKES, ... 36
CHARLES WATERTON AS A NATURALIST, ... 39
ROMANISM, ... 49
JOHN STUART MILL: A STUDY.
" " HIS RELIGION, ... 69
" " HIS EDUCATION, ... 82
" " A CRISIS IN HIS HISTORY, ... 90
" " HIS WIFE, ... 97
" " MILL AND SON, ... 105
SIMSON'S HISTORY OF THE GIPSIES, ... 111
MR. BORROW ON THE GIPSIES, ... 112
THE SCOTTISH CHURCHES AND THE SOCIAL EMANCIPATION OF THE GIPSIES, ... 150
WAS JOHN BUNYAN A GIPSY? 157
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE JEWS, ... 161
INDEX, ... 171

APPENDIX.

I. JOHN BUNYAN AND THE GIPSIES, ... 183
II. MR. FRANK BUCKLAND AND WHITE OF SELBORNE, . 187
III. MR. FRANK BUCKLAND ON THE VIPER, ... 192
IV. THE ENDOWMENT OF RESEARCH, ... 199

*VIPERS AND SNAKES GENERALLY.**

FOR some time back I have noticed communications in *Land and Water* on the question, "Do vipers swallow their young?" but I have not seen the subject investigated in this way: Has any one, in dissecting a female viper, found *eggs* within her? and has any one found *young ones* inside of another? If both have been found, then, as a matter of course, the reptile must have swallowed her progeny.

I will establish the principle by what I have observed on Long Island, a short distance from New York. When strolling with a friend, he very suddenly seized a stone and dashed it with all his might upon the top of a low dry stone wall, and killed a pretty large snake of the ordinary brown striped species, lying on it, basking in the sun. As it appeared more than ordinarily full about the body, I began to dissect it in a rough way, by tearing it apart with two sticks (for I did not like to touch it), to see what it contained, thinking it might be an animal it had swallowed, as a few days before I had killed another that had a frog partly down its gullet, feet foremost, but making no noise, when its intended prey hopped away as if it had not been injured. Having always understood that snakes were animals that "laid eggs," I was greatly surprised at finding about twenty snakelets of considerable size, and rather lively; but my friend asserted on the spot that snakes swallowed their young. This naturally led me to make inquiries, and I found a trustworthy neighbour who said positively that he had seen it done. Another, equally trustworthy, informed me that he found a *bunch* of snake's eggs when repairing a fence, and placed them as a curiosity on his mantelpiece, and one morning, very soon thereafter, he was surprised at finding a number of young snakes wriggling about on it, the heat of the fire having brought the eggs to the hatching point. Now it is extremely likely that the snake that laid these eggs was of the same species as the one that was killed, for both were in the same neighbourhood, where they were very numerous; and it is a peculiarity of snakes in America that you seldom or never find two kinds occupying the same ground—at least, during two years, I never came across any other kind than that of the one killed, and I saw many of them. I at once concluded that the snake that laid the eggs, and the one containing the young ones, were of the same species; and as a natural consequence, that the latter had swallowed her young—quite independent of the general belief, and the positive ocular testimony of one person as to the fact.†

Now to confirm the question by analogy, and on my own testimony. I have said that different kinds—at least certain kinds—of snakes are not apt to be found on the same ground. There is a deadly enmity between black-snakes and some others. At a place in New Jersey, where I frequently visited, and kept a lookout for snakes, I never met with any on the same ground but black ones. On one occasion I killed one, very full about the body, and took it to the house I was visiting for careful dissection, expecting to find it with young, when I would satisfy myself whether the

* Dated December 7th, 1872; printed 21st.

† As will be seen, they were of the identical species.

young had been swallowed or were in a state previous to birth. To my surprise I extracted fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen eggs (I forget which), all of one size, perhaps a little thicker at one end than the other, and of a dirty white colour, and soft, indiarubbery touch, connected together by a glutinous substance, and lying like a necklace along, as it were, the backbone of the animal. On being *torn* asunder the eggs contained a thick, milky-like matter. The glutinous substance would make the eggs stick together like a *bunch*, in the manner of those placed on the mantelpiece. Being all of one size and maturity, the snake would evidently lay them all at once, which she does somewhat like the turtle, to be hatched by heat, altogether disconnected from herself. Indeed the snake is such a cold-blooded animal—cold to touch in the hottest of weather—that it could not apparently hatch its eggs.* I came at once to the conclusion that, if brown and black snakes brought forth their young in the same way, then surely the brown snake had swallowed hers. To confirm this analogous proof, a friend, in whom every confidence can be placed, positively affirmed that a black-snake—of the same species as the one from which I took the eggs—was cut in two in his presence, when about twenty young ones were taken out of it, of about five inches long, and so active that they had to be killed to prevent their escape. In short, the mother had swallowed them.

I then consulted an old New Jersey justice, a very reliable man, who ploughed up many a nest of snake's eggs, generally near the stumps of trees, and exposed to the sun. He says that the covering resembled the white of a hen's egg very hard boiled—a fair description of those taken out of the animal. He says that he has taken the young out of various kinds of snakes, particularly black ones, and that the creatures always conducted themselves as if they had been on the earth before. He knew a number of people, who not only saw young snakes run into the mother's mouth, but took them out of her after killing her. As to the swallowing, he does not understand how any one could doubt it.

I repeat the question I started with — Has anyone in England found *eggs* in a viper? and has anyone found *young ones* in the same species? If both have been found, then the latter were swallowed; for it would be simply absurd to say that the same animal could bring forth its young in both ways. As American snakes swallow their young, the same should easily be believed of the English viper, even if no one had seen it done. It has surprised me that, at this time of day, such a question should be an open one. What is the meaning of science, if it cannot be settled whether or not vipers swallow their young without it being necessary for people to see it done? I should think the anatomy of the reptile, in the hands of a skilful man, would show whether it was an egg or animal-bearing creature. Mr. Frank Buckland is, therefore, very unreasonable, when he says he will not believe that vipers swallow their young, unless he or some one else sees it done: and still more so, when he expects the creature to do it to order in a state of captivity, when it has no incentive to do it. It is uncertain what leads snakes to do it. Perhaps they do it for no particular reason, when they take charge of the young after being

* This is in allusion to the oviparous snakes, the eggs of which are hatched in the ground. The so-called viviparous bring the eggs far forward to maturity inside of them, leaving it an open question whether the eggs are hatched inside or outside of the reptile, or in the act of parturition.

hatched by means independent of themselves. It would be impossible for such a tiny creature to move about on the rough ground old snakes go over. Sometimes it might be to protect them from the weather, or carry them off in time of danger. The brown snake, killed in my presence, could not have been influenced by fear, for there had been none near her when suddenly approached by myself and friend, and particularly as she was basking, as I have said, on the top of a low stone wall, where it was apparently impossible for the young ones to get, unless taken there inside of the mother. In a state of captivity, the snake can have no apparent incentive to take her young inside of her. Although the neck of a snake is narrow, it has an immense power of distension when gradually swallowing its prey, while retaining its powers of breathing. The female has doubtless peculiarities given her by nature for taking her young down her throat and keeping them alive there. Once down, her great distension of body furnishes them with an excellent place of safety. It has often been observed that snakes of a size not likely to be able to take care of themselves are seldom or never seen.

Some of your readers may not be aware that snakes (some species at least) shed their skins late in the spring or early in the summer, although it is not known that *every* snake gets a new coat *every* year.* On the place on Long Island mentioned, where the brown snakes were very numerous, I came across a skin that had been shed apparently the previous year, as it was considerably weather-beaten and dilapidated; but a few days afterwards (about the end of May), I found a beautiful specimen, soft and complete, including even the covering of the eyes—in short, a complete snake, barring the animal inside. Indeed, I thought it was a snake till it did not move, when I approached it considerately, and before touching it, carefully examined how it could have wriggled itself *so completely* out of its skin. I found that it had caught itself a little below the head (or shoulders, if I may so express myself) on a knot on the stem of a small but stout dry weed of the previous year's growth. I gave it to the person who killed the snake containing the young ones, on his going to visit his friends in Scotland, to show it to them, and keep for the purpose (as he said) of wrapping it round any *gathering*, to bring it to a head. Although a fine, it was not a large specimen.

I may add by way of P. S., by another mail, that I yesterday met a very intelligent man, long a farmer in Illinois, who, on being asked generally, "What about snakes?" informed me very fully in regard to them, and exactly as I have written. He says that he has often seen them, of various species, swallow their young, and that it is a very interesting sight. So quickly is it done, that it somewhat resembles a continuous glistening string passing into the mother's mouth. He says it takes place on the approach of wet weather and danger, and, as he supposes, when the snake wishes to "locomote." We see in this an amazing adaptation of means to an end, perhaps as wonderful a one as is to be found in natural history. For, when the snake goes to where she deposited her eggs to begin her maternal duties proper, and, in all probability, at the moment of hatching, she would be absolutely unable to take care of, perhaps, twenty helpless creatures, emerging from eggs about an inch in length, laid by a snake about three feet long, if

* All snakes doubtless shed their skins once a year; some people say oftener, with some species.

she did not take them inside of her, for she has no other way of providing for their safety; but, by the mutual instinct of "all aboard," she can at once proceed on her travels with her family; for a snake is an animal that lives altogether in the open, on sometimes very rough ground, and only retires to hidden places on the approach of cold weather to hybernate.*

In cutting open the black-snake mentioned, which was fully three feet long, I found that the string of eggs, say fifteen in number, would measure about fifteen inches in all, and were in a chamber of much greater height and width than was necessary to hold them—something apparently distinct from the stomach proper, and doubtless the receptacle for the young after being hatched outside, and which could be greatly expanded, according to the nature of snakes. Since we know that life is originated and maintained in an egg, and in a womb containing sometimes a dozen of young, it can be easily imagined that the young of a snake can have air supplied to them, temporarily at least, when confined in the way described, doubtless by a special provision of nature to that end. Perhaps they are even nourished in the same manner, for it cannot be imagined that a tiny creature can be fed in the gross way of the old one, which has no means for tearing and dividing its prey among its progeny. And this gives rise to the questions, how and on what new-born and young snakes are nourished, when not in a state of captivity?

It would be singular, indeed, if this peculiarity of snakes is not described in treatises on the natural history of the animal. I did not see it noticed in the long article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, on a hasty glance I gave it. To people inclined to doubt the facts given, I would say—how can they find eggs that are hatched outside of the animal that laid them, returning to the inside of the same animal in the shape of complete creatures, that can help themselves in any way, excepting only what a larger growth would enable them to do, unless they entered it by the mouth?

WHITE OF SELBORNE ON THE VIPER.†

WHAT I have said in regard to snakes having no other instinct or resource given them by nature for taking care of their young than receiving them inside of them, would not perhaps be sufficient to satisfy some English readers that the same peculiarity doubtless obtains with the British viper, unless I said something on what White of Selborne has recorded on the subject.

He advanced little of his own knowledge, and admitted that he was no authority, for he said:—"The reptiles, few as they are, I am not acquainted with so well as I could wish, with regard to their natural history. There is a degree of dubiousness and obscurity attending the propagation of this class

* This is in reference to the black and brown striped or garter snakes in America, and is not intended to apply to all snakes, whether of the land or water species. And the same may be said of some of the other peculiarities mentioned.

† Dated December 14th, 1872; printed January 11th, 1873.

of animals. . . . The serpent kind eat, I believe, but once a year, or rather but only just at one season of the year." [!] What he wrote really proved that the viper did swallow its young, for he said :—" Several intelligent folks assure me that they have *seen* the viper open her mouth and admit her helpless young *down her throat* on sudden surprise." This is very positive testimony of people having no apparent motive for imposing on him, nor likely to have been under an illusion themselves. But, in opposition to their evidence, he says : " The *London* viper-catchers insist on it that no such thing ever happens." That is, they never saw it done, perhaps during the season of viper-trapping, which really was no testimony at all.

He says that about the 24th of May, 1768, a neighbouring yeoman killed and took out of a viper " a chain of eleven eggs, about the size of those of a blackbird," such as I took out of an American black-snake which swallows her young. According to American snakes this would give about two feet for the mother, which is said to be seldom found much above that length, and four-and-a-half or five inches for the young when hatched. Seven years thereafter, on the 4th of August, 1775, he himself took out of another fifteen young ones,the *shortest* of which was fully *seven* inches in length, and about the size of full-grown earth-worms. Here,then, was a phenomenon for him to solve, viz.—the same animal (for argument's sake) containing a string of fifteen eggs about an inch long, lying along her back, after the nature of snakes, " none of them advanced so far towards a state of maturity as to contain any rudiments of young" (to the countryman's naked eye, for White does not say that *he* examined them), and seventy-two days thereafter appearing inside of her as *snakes* upwards of seven inches long, and so mature in their nature that they, " with the true viper spirit about them, showed great alertness as soon as disengaged from the belly of the dam, twisting and wriggling about, setting themselves up, and gaping very wide when touched with a stick, and showing manifest tokens of menace and defiance," to such an extent that he compared their action to " a young cock that will spar at his adversary before his spurs are grown, and a calf or lamb that will push with their heads before their horns are sprouted." Yet, notwithstanding that several intelligent people assured him that they had *seen* a viper admit her young down her throat, he says :—" There was little room to suppose that this brood had ever been in the open air before, and that they were taken in for refuge at the mouth of the dam when she perceived that danger was approaching." And for what reason ? " Because then, probably, we should have found them somewhere in the *neck* and not in the abdomen." That is, we might expect to find fifteen snakes seven inches and a fraction long, or fully *nine feet* of snakes, in the neck of the mother, that would be *three feet* long at the very most—in the *neck*, that to the eye or the imagination would hardly admit a passage for one of the young ones at such short notice as a sudden surprise would imply !

How did these eggs change to such complete, large, and active snakes before birth ? That is, how did a string of fifteen eggs, lying along the *back* of the animal, become fifteen snakes, upwards of seven inches long, so active and wicked before they were born, and so filling the *abdomen* of the mother that she seemed " very heavy and bloated ?" The very nature of an egg is to be laid and hatched by the animal laying it, or by the artifice of man, or by the elements. Yet White says of vipers :—" Though they are ovi-

parous, they are viviparous also, hatching their young within their bellies, and then bringing them forth"; perhaps drawing his conclusion from the phenomenon mentioned, and absolutely ignoring the testimony of people who had *seen* vipers swallow their young. It would be a curiosity in nature to find an animal that hatched an unlaid egg inside of itself; so great a curiosity as at once to be rejected unless it could be supported by evidence. Assuming, however, that the viper did it, we could understand how each of the young was nourished when inside of its own egg; but how would they be fed, or even kept alive, after leaving the eggs and entering and perhaps *running about* the abdomen at large? And why should snakes at least seven inches long, emerging from eggs one-seventh that length, be found *unborn* when they proved themselves so knowing on being forced to the light of day? Do unborn animals of any kind act in that way? And how did eggs that would yield snakes four-and-a-half or five inches long *when hatched*, produce ones from two-and-a-half to three inches longer before being born? And if they were born inside, what had become of the shells or rather coverings of the eggs? If they had been voided, why should not the young which they contained have followed in the same direction, and at the same time? White, by his own admission, knew little or nothing of the matter, and paid no regard to what others testified to of their own knowledge as to the swallowing of the young. He had most probably seen the snake that contained the eggs and killed the one himself containing the young, and concluded that therefore these young must have been hatched inside.*

It must therefore be held that the viper, like all animals producing eggs, is really an oviparous one, bringing forth her young like other serpents of her kind—that is, lays eggs to be hatched by the elements, and discharges her maternal duties like them by taking them inside of her on occasions, unless it can be proved otherwise by evidence that cannot be controverted. I of course mean when the animal is in her natural state and not in captivity, which would probably somewhat modify her instincts and habits. How could it be known that the eggs of vipers are hatched inside unless noticed at the time of birth, when the young and the substance that covered them emerged together, or the one (and which one?) before the other, and in the same direction? And how could it be learned that the eggs increase in maturity inside unless various vipers containing eggs are killed during the season, and a comparison be made as to their respective conditions? We would have then to ascertain *where* the bursting of the egg takes place—that is, inside or outside of the animal. If it takes place outside, no matter how shortly after the egg is laid, then is the viper an oviparous animal; and in that case how could we find vipers *inside* like those described by White, and as can be found any summer in England? Let a viper containing young, as described by White, be killed and submitted to properly qualified scientific men for inspection, and they would doubtless soon settle the question whether the young were unborn or had entered the mother by the mouth. If they found the young *and* the coverings of the eggs, they could say that they had been hatched inside; but if they found the young only, how

* It is surprising that White should have commented on this subject so superficially and unsatisfactorily, after contemplating the eggs and the young as being inside of the mother. This circumstance goes a very long way to prove that he was not a scientific naturalist.

could they say that they had been so hatched, and not taken in at the mouth, in common with all the American snakes, so far as known? Thereafter they could examine the anatomy of both, and if they found both alike, what reason could they have for saying that the viper did not, and could not, swallow her young, like the American serpents, whether the bursting of the egg took place at the time of birth, or before it, or after it had been laid? Being both snakes, and *conceiving* eggs in the same way, with the young more or less developed in them when laid (as laid they must be), it must be held, as I have just said, that vipers are not only oviparous, but "swallowers," unless it can be proved that they are neither, which would be an exceedingly difficult if not impossible matter to do, for the most that could be said would be that it was not known, which would only prove ignorance in regard to the subject.

So far from its being even plausible to say of White's vipers that there was "little room to suppose that the brood had ever been in the open air before," there is every reason for saying that they had been in the world for such time as enabled them to add perhaps two inches to their length, and gain considerable experience, which would account for their being so exceedingly active, like their American relations. They had simply been swallowed, but not from fear, at least immediate fear, for the mother was enjoying herself by lying in the grass and basking in the sun when killed (like the American snake on the top of a dry stone wall), having no fear for her young inside of her while she herself was safe. That is done in America for no apparent reason; perhaps merely to gratify the natural instinct of the mother, however she might feel in the event of her family quarrelling, when, I presume, she would be only too glad to drive them forth by the same power that enabled her to swallow them.

I have given a form of experiment for testing whether or not vipers swallow their young, by examining a dead one. I will now explain how it might be tried in the person of a living one. Let some one procure a pregnant viper (but distinguishing the appearance from that of having swallowed an animal much thicker than herself), and confine her in an open space suitable to her natural disposition, but from which she could not escape, and watch results. If she is pregnant with *eggs* she will either deposit them like American snakes, or retain them, according to White's theory, to be hatched inside of her. If she lays the eggs she will return to her natural size, and continue so till the eggs are hatched and the young ones require her care, when they will either be seen with her or found inside of her, which will manifest itself in her second pregnancy, causing her to become more "heavy and bloated" as they increase in size. If she is caught when pregnant with *young*, there will be times that they will be seen, causing a corresponding diminution in her size, and times when they will not be seen, causing her again to appear pregnant from having swallowed them. If she was pregnant with *eggs*, and brings forth according to White, it would not be possible, in her comparative freedom, to have a midwife present to ascertain whether the eggs were hatched inside or outside of the animal, or what became of the shells, that is, whether young and shells were voided at the same time, or which first. If, however, she came in pregnant, and suddenly produced young after remaining in her original state night and day for a considerable time (which fact never could be ascertained), then White's theory, to a certain extent, would appear correct as to the *hatch-*

ing; for the eggs of the American snake appear to be laid immediately after being formed, as they are sometimes found in the ground containing only the slightest tinge of fœtus, but otherwise exactly as I took them out of the animal, when I discovered no appearance of that in the eggs, which I examined (but not carefully) with the naked eye.

Mr. Frank Buckland has agreed to test the phenomenon of swallowing in a very unphilosophical way, by procuring a viper with young already born or hatched—he probably does not know which—and asks for proof of the swallowing while the creature is in the hands of the Philistines, when she has no call to do it, to carry the young anywhere, or protect them from the weather, or preserve them from approaching danger that is avoidable. In short, her captivity prevents that which Mr. Buckland insinuates it should lead to—a very ingenious and *frank* way to choke off proswallowers. Cats generally will not even look at rats when interfered with in their own way and place of tackling them. There is nothing to prevent Mr. Buckland making the experiments I have suggested. He has already "taken proceedings" in the matter, but in a very unreasonable manner; and it is to be hoped he will do something further, and gratify the curiosity of naturalists everywhere, whatever the result might be.

I need not suggest the experiment of trying to hatch the eggs of the viper in a temperature like that of the place from which they were taken, in the same way that the American brought forth his snakes on the mantelpiece; for if she *lays eggs*, that would settle the question as to her being a "swallower." I may, however, say something more about the American experiment. The gentleman who conducted it I had hunted up, after a lapse of thirteen years (sometimes a rather difficult matter in America), and examined fully. There was no fire burning, as it was in July. He killed the mother, which was hovering about, apparently in the expectation of her services being required, as the eggs proved very near the hatching point. He took one of them to his place of business in New York, to satisfy incredulous people, and fortunately the birth took place on a table, in the presence of several people. The young snake, which measured six inches in length, made its appearance by the head, gradually uncoiling itself out of its prison, which was an inch long, but not nearly so broad, and did not break in pieces like a brittle fowl's egg on being hatched, but opened in two, as the outside covering of some kinds of nuts come apart. It proved of the ordinary brown striped species (a harmless kind), the same as the old one killed, which was about three feet long—an exact description of the one from which I took the young ones. Immediately after it disengaged itself, it began to move about in a pretty lively way like snakes, but did not prove in any way belligerent when touched. It was then put into spirits and preserved. The substance covering it resembled ordinary paper in thickness, and dry, but considerably attenuated from its original condition.* The eggs found by this gentleman were in a pretty bunch or cluster, all sticking together, but how formed he did not know till I told him that before being laid they were in a string, lying along the back of the snake, loosely connect-

* If fifteen or twenty eggs, lying along the back of a snake, were hatched inside in the way described, we would have, on a small scale, something worse than an earthquake. Or, imagine the eggs, hatched at birth like the bursting of a shell at the mouth of a gun, or some time after leaving it, and returning to the gun, without being taken into it, and we would have the doctrine of anti-swallowers well illustrated.

ed by a soft glutinous substance, and apparently ready to be laid; when he concluded with me that they had all been deposited at once, with a spiral or circular turn of the animal, which would give them the shape in which they were found. The New Jersey and Illinois gentlemen assert that the eggs found by them (about three inches below the surface in loose soil in Illinois) were not so connected together—but then they ploughed them up.* Those from Long Island and Illinois assert that different kinds of snakes are found on the same ground, although my experience, which was much less than theirs, found it otherwise.† The young of a snake from two to three feet long, when born, they say, are from four-and-a-half to six inches in length, and, although helpless to protect themselves, are exceedingly nimble—"sharp as needles," as illustrated by their passing like a "continuous glistening string" down the mother's throat, when by her peculiar "hiss" she calls them to her on the approach of danger, although they are always near her; and that very young snakes are never seen by themselves, and seldom even with the mother, for the reason that she has already provided for their disappearance on the approach of danger. The Long Islander never saw snakes so disappear, but one day he heard the peculiar hiss, the meaning of which he knew well from description, although the snake was hidden from view, and he made a rush to where it seemed to be, to see the phenom-

* The eggs found on Long Island had evidently been deposited in a confined space, which would make them bunch or cluster, in place of being connected by the ends, by the glutinous substance, as when laid.

† Some kinds of snakes are found on the same ground, although they live separately, except when they hybernate, when several kinds are found together. Some species not only make war upon but devour others. Here is what Hunter, to whom I will again refer, says on the subject:—

"Both the rattle and black snakes prey on them [the prairie dog]: . . . . but their destruction would be still more considerable were it not for the perpetual belligerency of these reptiles" (p. 177). "The common black, copperhead, and spotted swamp snakes never fail, I believe, to engage with and destroy them [the rattlesnakes] whenever they meet, which, together with the hostility that exists between the two species [of rattlesnakes, the black and parti coloured], prevents an increase that would otherwise render the country almost uninhabitable" (p. 179). "When the two species [of rattlesnakes] fight, it is by coiling and striking at each other; they frequently miss in their aim, or rather avoid each other's fangs by darting simultaneously in a direction different from the approaching blow. When one is bitten, it amounts to a defeat, and it instantly retreats for a watering place, at which, should it arrive in time, it slakes its thirst, swells, and dies. I have witnessed the effects of the poison on their own bodies, or on those of the antagonist species, in several instances, and have never known one that was bitten to recover, notwithstanding the generally prevailing opinion to the contrary, that such instinctively resort to efficient antidotes" (p. 179). "In one instance, I vexed a rattlesnake till it bit itself, and subsequently saw it die from the poison of its own fangs. I also saw one strangled in the wreathed folds of its inveterate enemy, the black-snake" (p. 118). "The other hostile snakes grasp their necks between their teeth, wreathe round, and strangle them" (p. 179).

"Rattlesnakes . . . . would infest the country to a much greater extent, were it not for the hostility that exists between them and the deer. This animal, on discovering a snake, as I have repeatedly witnessed, retreats some distance from it, then running with great rapidity alights with its collected feet upon it, and repeats this manœuvre till it has destroyed its enemy" (p. 116).

Others state that the deer runs round and round the snake, narrowing the circle each time, till it lights upon it with its feet, as described, and destroys it. It is not mentioned that the deer destroys any other species of snakes; and, if that is true, the curious question would arise, how is the deer enabled to make the distinction in the case of the rattlesnake only?

enon, but he was too late, for the young ones had already been swallowed. He, however, killed the snake, when the young ones ran out of her mouth. They proved of the same species as those hatched by him, and those taken by me out of a snake. He said that the mother became comparatively helpless after the operation, and showed a wonderful disregard for her own safety in her desire to protect her family. The Illinois gentleman positively asserted that he had seen a young black-snake, fully a foot and a half long, enter the mouth of its mother, which was fully six feet in length. As a general thing, a knowledge of the habits of snakes, more than perhaps any other animal, can be acquired only by a person collecting the experience of others, and comparing it with his own; one having observed one thing, and another another. None I have spoken to know how new-born snakes are fed. They suppose that being born so active they gather their food as newly-hatched chickens do—picking it up themselves, perhaps with the assistance of the mother, but, of course, seizing much smaller prey than would suit her. They do not consider it impossible that they might at first be nourished by the mother by the same means she uses for their protection when she takes them down her throat. All over America young people are often killing snakes, some of them pregnant with young and some with eggs, and sometimes the same species pregnant with both, but not, of course, at the same time, which, as well as swallowing of the young, cause them no small astonishment, and there the matter rests. But older and more intelligent people understand the phenomenon of the animal laying her eggs to be hatched in the soil, and then taking the young inside of her for their protection; and they often express their surprise that this peculiarity of the serpent tribe is not described, or hardly recorded, in the pages of natural history. There are a great variety of snakes in America. Sometimes in the West, on a small-sized farm containing prairie and timber and a little swampy land, there will be found at least seven different kinds. All over the country they are found in the gardens, and at times in the barns, corn-cribs and milk-houses, and occasionally even in the houses.

I will conclude by saying that, for the many reasons given, the British viper is doubtless a "swallower," and oviparous or semi-oviparous. It would be strange indeed if the alleged fact of her swallowing her young cannot be proved by trustworthy ocular testimony. If it can be demonstrated that she is even *semi*-oviparous in the proper sense of the word, then it necessarily follows that she is a "swallower," since she is found with young inside of her.

The philosophical naturalist, of all men, should be guided in these matters by his reason, by analogy and the nature of things, along with his eyes, and not by his eyes alone, and should remember that facts in natural history take precedence of everything. The snake has neither feet, wings, nor fins, and is easily disabled, a sharp stroke with a switch being sufficient to break the back of one of considerable size; and many of them have little or no means of defence to protect themselves, to say nothing of sometimes twenty of a progeny. As mammals are provided with means for giving birth to their large-sized young, it is not unreasonable to suppose that serpents, at the proper season, are enabled to receive theirs down their throats for protection. The anatomy of their mouths, throats, and stomachs will doubtless substantiate this opinion. Such a phenomenon is not contrary to the laws of nature,

but rather illustrative of them. For, as St. Paul says, "All flesh is not the same flesh; for there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds," and we might add another of *serpents*, each having natural laws peculiar to itself, and illustrating the wonderfully diversified works of the Creator of all. The serpent, however much she is hated, has been an object of interest, wonder, or worship at all times and among all nations. In Genesis she is described as "more subtile than any beast of the field," and the highest of all authority commands us to imitate her for her wisdom, provided it is allied with the harmlessness of the dove.

WHITE OF SELBORNE ON SNAKES.*

WHITE, in his Natural History of Selborne, page 126, edition 1833, says:—"Monographers, come from whence they may, have, I think, fair pretence to challenge some regard and approbation from the lovers of natural history; for, as no man can alone investigate all the works of nature, these partial writers may, each in his department, be more accurate in their discoveries, and freer from errors, than more general writers, and so by degrees may pave the way to a universal correct natural history." "Men that undertake only one district are much more likely to advance natural knowledge than those that grasp at more than they can possibly be acquainted with. Every kingdom, every province, should have its own monographer" (p. 128). "It has been my misfortune never to have had any neighbours whose studies have led them toward the pursuit of natural knowledge; so that, for want of a companion to quicken my industry and sharpen my attention, I have made but slender progress in a kind of information to which I have been attached from my childhood" (p. 39). "It is no small undertaking for a man, unsupported and alone, to begin a natural history from his own autopsia. Though there is endless room for observation in the field of nature, which is boundless, yet investigation (where a man endeavours to be sure of his facts) can make but slow progress; and all that one could collect in many years would go into a very narrow compass" (p. 118).

A state of ignorance in regard to the serpent tribe cannot be said to exist in America, although the knowledge possessed by people is of a casual and partial nature, more or less recent and rusty, and disconnected from any theory or system, which makes it all the more reliable to a person who will gather it up, like pieces of a puzzle lying loosely around, and arrange it into a whole. In the event of the present papers finding their way back to America, and being so brought before the notice of the public as to really interest it, I am satisfied that more could be collected from intelligent people in or from country places, than one would perhaps care to be troubled with; for to them a story about snakes is always interesting.† I am really astonish-

* Dated January 11th, 1873; printed July 19th and August 23d.

† Under the article "American Science Convention on Snakes" it will be seen that a newspaper notice on the subject of snakes called forth, from different parts of the United States, no less than ninety-six answers.

ed at how much I meet with incidentally, sometimes where I could hardly have expected it. Thus I was introduced to a gentleman who had seen an adder on Staten Island, with many young ones, which almost instantly disappeared, he did not know how; but he killed her, and as she seemed very "heavy and bloated," he cut her open, and found upwards of twenty young ones inside of her. The dog of an old acquaintance of mine killed another adder, and shook the eggs out of her, when they appeared ready to be laid; and he himself happened to kick a piece of loose turf near his house, and found a nest of brown striped snake's eggs under it, very near the hatching point. On a trip to Baltimore, at the new year, I dropped into conversation on the subject of snakes with three people only, who happened to sit next me, with the following result. First, with a Virginia Negro, who found, when hoeing a field of Indian corn, a nest of black-snake's eggs, twenty-eight in number, and very near the time of hatching. The next was an engineer or machinist, returning from doing a job on the railroad, who saw a snake, close to water, in the State of Delaware, with fully twenty young ones, which instantly entered her mouth, when she plunged into the stream. The other was a very respectable-looking and intelligent farmer, from the same State, who saw the ordinary brown striped snake swallow her young, when he killed her, and found them more than half way down her body. He also found a nest of eggs of the same species, nearly ready to be hatched, under a shallow stone that little more than rested on the ground, when clearing up a field. Both these men said that they were so completely fascinated by the phenomenon, and the "quick as winkie" way in which the young disappeared, that they lost their presence of mind for the moment, as happens with every one on such occasions, especially for the first time. Indeed, the plunging of the snake into the water with all her family aboard of her took away the man's breath, as for an instant it did mine, till I saw and was told it was a water-snake. I immediately remembered that an acquaintance, worthy of every confidence, told me that he had several times seen water-snakes in North Carolina swallow their young. Water is, perhaps for the most part, their natural element, to which they flee in time of danger, and they are always near it, somewhat like water-rats. In approaching people for information, so far from putting leading questions, I almost invariably begin as one utterly ignorant of the subject, and dropping on it by accident, and let them tell their stories complete, and if time and circumstances permit, then question and cross-question them to the most minute detail, in the most approved legal way, giving them at the close of the "investigation" my reasons for doing so. I almost invariably find them "interested witnesses" in the proper sense of the word, easy to manage, and excited, as most people who have been brought in contact with snakes are apt to be, on the subject being mentioned to them. In America those that notice animated nature are always intelligent, whatever might be their education, and generally men of humanity in proportion to the interest they take in the subject. But, as Gilbert White says, "the bane of our science is the comparing of one animal to the other by memory" (p. 135), which applies to some extent to the composition of these papers, and gives them a rather rambling character, but perhaps adds to what interest they may possess for that very reason. Thus, to return to the American snakes swallowing their young.

When the young enter the mother, they must, in the nature of things, turn themselves and lie inside in the same direction as her, for the air, "bringing their heads to windward;" and that is done very quickly, as they ran out of the mouth of the mother killed by the Long Islander so soon after he heard, at a few paces off, her hiss for her progeny to betake themselves to their place of refuge. And that reminds me that the young snakes taken out of the mother in my presence all lay in the same direction. White says that the viper killed by him was "crowded with young." In America the phrase is "packed" or "stuffed" with them, the usual number given being "about twenty" or "fully twenty." The Virginia Negro, as I have already said, counted twenty-eight eggs in a nest, all with young that would be hatched in three or four days, judging from his experience with fowls' eggs. Other nests are found with as few as twelve or thirteen eggs. The eggs of snakes cannot addle for the same reason as fowls', for the only natural risk they run is from the elements; and the animal is so "wise in her generation" as to choose a place of deposit safe from everything except, perhaps, excessive rain or cold. The water-snake deposits her eggs in little island-like hillocks, a little above the water-mark, and covers them with what dry stuff she can find on them.

It is necessary for snakes to have a large progeny to provide against their many enemies, of which the pig is not the least formidable; for the best means of ridding a neighbourhood of snakes, even the most venomous, is to turn out the pigs for the purpose. They fight the rattlesnake most scientifically, dodging it, and at the worst presenting the cheek or side of the neck to its blow, when they seize it, and with their teeth and feet soon rend it. It is difficult for poisonous snakes to injure a pig, for its skin, fat, and absence of small veins generally, prevent serious consequences. When a rattlesnake is killed, and placed on a road where a pig will pass, the pig starts aside at first, and then seizes the snake with great gusto, to the amusement of those placing it there for the purpose. The Illinois gentleman, mentioned in the first and second papers, when going to his hay-field, saw a black-snake swallow her young, and drove his hay-fork into her, and carried mother and young over his shoulder and threw them into his pig-pen, when the animals started, but as quickly proceeded to enjoy their delicacy.

I will now consider what White of Selborne put on record about snakes depositing their eggs and shedding their skins, prefacing what I have to say with some general remarks of his own. He wrote: "Candour forbids me to say absolutely that any fact is false because I have never been witness to such a fact" (p. 127). "My remarks are the result of many years' observation, and are, I trust, true on the whole; though I do not pretend to say that they are perfectly void of mistake, or that a more nice observer might not make many additions, since subjects of this kind are inexhaustible" (p. 180). "The question which you put with regard to those genera of animals that are peculiar to America . . . is too puzzling for me to answer; and yet so obvious as often to have struck me with wonder" (p. 90), —which remark was applicable, at the time, to the opossum, which carries her progeny in her pouch, to which they flee in time of danger; while she will feign dead, notwithstanding the roughness of the usage she may receive, when she finds she cannot escape; this peculiarity being also exhibited by the young before they have left the mother.

"This would be adding wonder to wonder, and instancing in a fresh manner that the methods of Providence are not subject to any mode or rule, but astonish us in new lights, and in various and changeable appearances" (p. 111). These quotations, and those to follow, are taken from his observations on subjects in which he was perfectly at home, and are now applied to those of which he knew very little, as he admitted, and for that reason are much more applicable to the two questions on hand.

In America snakes are found pregnant with eggs in the spring, or early in the summer; then the eggs are hatched in the ground, and the young are found with the mother or inside of her. The interval between the laying and the hatching may be six weeks; the Illinois gentleman says it may be four or five weeks, so difficult is it to arrive at the time actually required, to say nothing of the uncertainty of a person's memory in regard to what he has casually observed. The Virginia Negro said that the eggs he found when hoeing his Indian corn could not possibly have been deposited till after the ground was ploughed, which could not have been more than six weeks previous to the eggs being found very near the hatching point. In the Middle and Western States the ground is ploughed for corn say about the 1st of May, planted on the 8th, and hoed on the 31st, which would make a month; and allow a week more for the Virginia style of farming, and we have about five weeks for the eggs to mature. The time that intervened between the dog shaking the eggs out of the snake and its owner finding a nest of them nearly ready to hatch (although they were of different species) was exactly a month; so that four or five weeks would be a safe estimate for the time a snake's eggs require to hatch. I admit that there may be some difference between the British and American snakes, as there is between the rabbits, for the American rabbit does not burrow—as illustrated by an American's remark when he said, "I will give £5 for every hole dug by an American rabbit, which does not show even a scrape of its foot on the ground." But between the snakes there cannot be such a difference as is implied in White's remark, when he says:—"Snakes lay chains of eggs every summer in my melon beds, in spite of all that my people can do to prevent them, which eggs do not hatch till the spring following, as I have often experienced" (p. 70.) Both snakes lay chains of eggs, and deposit them in the ground; but why should the eggs of British snakes be laid in the summer, and remain in the earth all the winter, and be hatched in the spring, when the eggs of the American snakes are hatched in four or five weeks after being laid? White's assertion is contrary to the analogy of nature, for it is only the insects on land, existing but for a season, that leave eggs to be hatched the following year. White, by his own account, had many opportunities for experimenting on the hatching of snakes' eggs. He could easily have surrounded a nest, when they would have hatched, although the assistance of the mother might have been necessary to remove the soil, to allow the young ones to come to the surface; but he throws no light on the subject. Even in regard to his favourites, the birds, he says:—"I am no bird-catcher; and so little used to birds in a cage, that I fear, if I had one, it would soon die for want of skill in feeding" (p. 116). It is difficult to account for his antipathy, as that of a naturalist, to snakes when they could not injure his melon beds, and his indifference to their peculiarities, when he had such opportunities for observing them, for he says:—"The reptiles,

few as they are, I am not acquainted with, so well as I could wish, with regard to their natural history. There is a degree of dubiousness and obscurity attending the propagation of this class of animals" (p. 66). What he says in regard to the hatching of their eggs must, therefore, be rejected in the absence of details of the data from which he drew his conclusion.

He says the eggs were laid *every summer* in his *melon beds*, in spite of all his people could do to prevent it, but says nothing of the rest of the garden, nor explains why the snakes preferred the other part of the ground. When the eggs were deposited, the soil had either not been dug, and, when dug, they would be discovered and destroyed; or the seeds of the melons had been sown or had sprung, when no opportunity would be given for discovering the nest, by such cultivation as the melons required; or, if they were so discovered, they would be destroyed by the gardener, in obedience to orders, or from his natural antipathy to the animal, and particularly as it would involve no trouble in doing it. Besides, it is natural to suppose a snake would leave no trace of her nest, unless when she disturbed newly and finely-dressed ground, requiring an expert to tell what it implied, which White's people were not apt to be. If the eggs were not discovered, how did White know they were there at all, or if discovered, that they were laid in the summer and hatched in the spring? Or how did he know that they were not intended for a second brood, or were not a second laying after the first had been destroyed? One cannot easily account for the snakes preferring the melon beds to the exclusion of the rest of the garden, and especially in the face of the persecution which they suffered year after year for so doing. In short, White's assertion as to the eggs lying in the ground all winter must be rejected, unless it could be proved; and it must be held that British like American snakes deposit eggs to be hatched the same year. White, at least, admits that the viper contains eggs about the 27th of May, and young ones by the 4th of August.

The nest of the black-snake, like that of other species, is never found except when turned up by accident. The Illinois gentleman, on a closer examination, says the eggs, completely covered by about three inches of loose soil, which slightly flattens the tops of them, are found neatly coiled in a solid circle, one tier deep, and connected by a substance like a loosely-made cotton thread, that is easily broken, and is covered with something like mildew, which in a less degree attaches to the eggs and the earth immediately surrounding them. This connecting thread, noticed by others on a like occasion, was the remains of the glutinous substance connecting the eggs, which were taken out of one of the same species by myself. This evidence somewhat contradicts that of the Long Islander, who, however, insists that the eggs found by him were in a bunch or cluster, but then they were of another species, and deposited in a different soil. On one occasion, the young, on the eggs being opened, ran about three yards, but died, apparently from the effects of the sun, which is doubtless a reason for the mother taking them inside of her for some time after birth. A snake when at rest naturally chooses the warmest spot, where the rays of the sun are concentrated, especially at the opening and closing of the season, and which would be too strong for her newly-born progeny without some covering. That doubtless accounts for the one containing the young being killed on the top of a dry stone wall, nearly three feet high. I had some difficulty in see-

ing how she could have got on the wall with so many young inside of her, till I learned she was a climber, a friend having killed one of the same species when emptying a bird's nest of its young, about six feet up a tree-like bush, when he took the birds out of her, the mother all the while screaming and flying around.*

In regard to the snake shedding its skin, White says:—"It would be a most entertaining sight, could a person be an eye-witness to such a feat, and see the snake in the act of changing its garment" (p. 383). But as that would be a difficult matter, we must judge of the act by the nature of things. So uniform is nature, that we must conclude that all snakes cast their sloughs in the open air, from the fact of so many being found there, and, so far as known, nowhere else. White says that a skin found by him, in a field near a hedge, "appeared as if turned wrong side outward, and as drawn off backward, like a stocking or woman's glove." But stockings and gloves cannot be drawn off inside out. Again he says, "snakes crawl out of the mouth of their own sloughs," and there he is right, but very confused when he adds, "and quit the tail part last, just as eels are skinned by a cook-maid." How could a stocking or glove be drawn off "just as eels are skinned"? The cook makes an incision round the neck, and takes hold of the head in one hand and the skin in the other, and pulls opposite ways, so that the skin must come off "wrong side outward." It would be as impossible for a snake to turn its skin inside out, as it came out of it, as it would be for a hand to draw itself out of its glove with the same result; even the glove must be placed against something presenting resistance to allow the hand to be pulled out of it in the ordinary way. It would be interesting to see an unsophisticated man like White attempt with his sock or glove what he asserts the snake must have done. He seems to have forgotten what he said on another occasion. "I delight very little in analogous reasoning, knowing how fallacious it is with regard to natural history" (p. 106). "Ingenious men will readily advance plausible arguments to support whatever theory they shall choose to maintain; but then the misfortune is, every one's hypothesis is each as good as another's, since they are all founded on conjecture" (p. 90). The British snake can shed its skin in no other way than the American one, that is, leave it right side outward, and no more turning it than a scabbard would be turned by the sword being drawn out of it, as the Illinois gentleman expressed it. If snakes shed their skins when in a state of captivity, it should be known in England how it is done.

The shedding of its skin doubtless causes a snake pain or sickness, but that is not likely to arise from the thick part of the body passing through the skin of a narrower part. The stretching of the skin in itself must be a pleasant sensation, when the animal swallows its prey. The sickness must proceed from the skin separating from the body, as it probably does gradually and all over. The snake then requires something to press its side against, for the resistance necessary to enable it to pull itself out of its old garment.†

* Snakes do not ascend a tree corkscrew-like, as some might think, but straight up, as they go on the ground, but not of course so fast. Many of them are also excellent swimmers.

† The following appeared in *Land and Water*, on the 11th October, 1873:—

"SNAKES SHEDDING THEIR SKINS.—Sir: Mr. Higford Burr, in *Land and Water* of the 13th September, in allusion to my article on the 23d August, advances the idea of White of Selborne, which I did not consider of sufficient importance to notice, that snakes cast their skins inside out because 'the coverings of the eyes are concave' or hollow. That, in my opinion, is the very reason

I find that I omitted, in my paper of the 14th December, to ask under what circumstances Mr. Buckland's viper and her young ones were caught, and what were their respective lengths, and whether the progeny might not have been past the swallowing age, since he has said that they had not favoured him with an exhibition of their dexterity in that respect.

Much is said of the snake that would indicate that she is possessed of wisdom, but which I will not put on record, for the reason that I am not in a position to vouch for it. But in regard to her taking care of her young, she must be very wise when contrasted with the ostrich, "which leaveth her eggs in the earth, and warmeth them in the dust, and forgetteth that the foot may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. She is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers; her labour is in vain without fear, because God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath he imparted to her understanding."—Job xxxix., 14–17.*

SNAKES SWALLOWING THEIR YOUNG.†

A COMMUNICATION I sent *Land and Water*, on the 11th of January, contained a reply to the question of R. S. F., printed on the 18th, as to how young snakes enter the stomach of the mother, and how they leave it. They go in head foremost and come out head foremost — turning, of course, inside. I said that all those taken out of a snake by myself lay in the same direction as the mother. I did not examine them particularly in that respect, but that was their position so far as I noticed and remembered. They certainly were lying lengthwise. The Illinois gentleman, so far as he remembers, found them lying some one way and some another. He does not consider it

why they are *not* cast 'inside out.' Before the snake can begin to move out of its skin it must loosen itself at the head, and then, as it were, 'crawl out of its mouth,' which would involve more or less tugging, pulling, or wrenching of the body to separate it from the skin. When that takes place, the thin, and at first doubtless soft, scales of the eyes will naturally be *pulled in*, and retain that position, or fall into it, after the slough has been left behind. But if the snake turns its skin wrong side out in any way, or as White supposes as 'an eel is skinned,' then the coverings of the eyes would be *pulled out* or be convex. Without examining the eyes, my own experience and that of others I have conversed with on the subject is that the skins are not found inside out; and that must be held to be the true position of the matter till the opposite can be demonstrated. It would have been something to the point had Mr. Burr told us how the skin itself looked, for surely any one could easily tell of a newly-shed skin whether it was right or wrong side out; or had he informed us how a snake could possibly turn its skin as it came out of it, and, in addition to that, preserve in such a convulsion the delicate scales of the eyes intact. He does not say to what extent the eyes were concave, nor in what position the skin was found, nor its surroundings with reference to its shedding. I refer him to what I said on the subject on the occasion mentioned, and I would add that his finding the scales of the eyes concave did not warrant his conclusion that 'there can be no further doubt about it,' that the animal left its garment the opposite way it wore it.—J. S. (New York, September 27).

[According to my experience the cast skins of snakes are always turned inside out.—F. BUCKLAND.]"

Many hold to the opinion expressed by Messrs. Burr and Buckland. It is simply a matter of proof, and it can be considered an open question. How a snake sheds its skin in confinement would not necessarily be a fair criterion of how it does it in a state of nature; for unless it is furnished with the means of doing it as it would choose, it will be apt to make a mess of the operation. As a question of conjecture, it is much easier to imagine that the reptile wriggles out of its skin rather than parts from it as White describes the phenomenon.

* It would appear that Job is not strictly accurate in his description of the ostrich. Neither he nor Solomon seems to have noticed that the serpent swallows her young for their protection.

† Dated February 8th, 1873.

necessary that they should turn while confined in their place of refuge, but that turn they must when they leave it.

I gave an instance of their running out of a brown striped snake after the Long Islander killed her. I give another in the adder, noticed by a very trustworthy young friend, who saw several young ones run out of the mother, when lying on a road fatally injured by some one, mashed and helpless. Having an aversion to snakes, he did not examine her otherwise than when passing, but he distinctly saw the young ones coming out of the mouth. We can only conjecture in regard to the physical circumstances of the mother swallowing her young. She can doubtless permit and refuse admission, by simply opening and shutting her mouth when she ceases to swallow them, doubtless considerably, if not long, before she casts them off altogether, as all animals do with their young. Perhaps there is nothing worthy of special notice in the anatomy of the throat or stomach to receive, reject, or retain young of a certain age, if we judge from the fact of the young running out after the mother is killed, unless it should be that nature provides her with the instinct of giving a passage in her last gasp for the escape of her progeny. The circumstances under which the young enter the mother should influence them in their movements when inside; for, if they enter under the influence of fear, they will naturally be on the *qui vive* what to do when there, and so turn inside to be ready, if taken in the rear, to run out as instinctively as they ran in.

There is a phrase in the letter of R. S. F. to which I object. He speaks of its being a "theory" that snakes swallow their young. The right expression is that it is a fact. For example, as regards the black and brown striped or garter snake in particular, we have eggs taken out of them, and eggs found in the ground when ready or nearly ready to hatch, and then the young found in the mother. Should not that satisfy any reasonable person that the young were swallowed? To that add that the young have been seen to run out of the mother when killed; and, to crown all, that they have been seen to run into her, and have been taken out of her by the same people—all of which establish it as a fact, and not as a theory, that snakes swallow their young. If R. S. F. does not know how snakes are brought into the world and taken care of in the first stage of their existence, and can refer to no one who does, why should he object to what I have written on the subject? If he admits that the snake lays a "string of eggs," how can he doubt that the chamber that contained them can also hold their contents, to say nothing of the extra room when the eggs were there, and the further expansion of the animal when the young are received inside? The turning inside would seem to be the easiest part of the phenomenon; nor can there be any difficulty in believing that the young can be kept alive, after the exceedingly mature and lively vipers taken by White of Selborne out of a mother.

I avail myself of this opportunity to suggest that Mr. Buckland should give us some information regarding his viper and her progeny, embraced under the following heads: When, on what kind of ground, where, how, and by whom caught, and how carried to their present place of keeping? What were the mother and young ones doing, and how far from each other were they when seen and caught? What resistance did the old one make, and how did she defend her young, and how did they act, on the occasion? And how did it happen that the family were bagged at the same time? Or, how many of them were caught,

and how many escaped, and how did they escape? What was the length of the mother and progeny when caught? How have they at various times been housed or kept? If exposed to the air, how did they appear in warm, wet, and cold weather? How watered and fed, and particularly, how the young ones were watered and fed? How has the mother behaved towards the family and the family towards her, and how towards her keeper and others, and the same in regard to the young? with a detailed account of all other particulars noticed of the mother and young since their capture. Did the old one shed her skin, and, if so, how and when? What are the seasons during which people from London do and do not catch vipers?

SNAKES SWALLOWING THEIR YOUNG.*

"NO ox casts its hide so that it can be picked up and made boots of, no horse swallows a mouthful as wide if not twice as wide as its body, and no sow on the approach of danger receives her infantile grunters inside of her; therefore no snake does any of these things." "If I were told that a snake receives her young inside of her, I would not believe it on any evidence, for the reason that I do not understand how it could be done, or what purpose it would serve."

Apply this style of reasoning to the communication of D. of Yorktown, Virginia, printed in *Land and Water* on the 1st February, and you have a pretty fair description of what is the production of one who is evidently not an American. He advances nothing of his own knowledge nor of that of others. Indeed he says, "I am not familiar with the supposed young-swallowing snakes"—a sufficient reason for him to have kept silent on the subject; but he adds, "I have often observed other kinds"—without saying what kinds, or what he has noticed of them. I doubt not he has seen snakes in a field, or crossing a road, or along a fence, but that seems to be the extent of his knowledge of them. His ideas have evidently been culled from printed matter, and intermixed with crude suppositions of his own, and then put forth in a manner that entitles him to little ceremony on being taken notice of, particularly when he speaks of the "mist that surrounds myself and others in the matter of snakes," basing his remarks on the detailed and circumstantial evidence of several people on snakes swallowing their young, contained in my paper printed on the 21st December. The affidavits of twenty people of the highest credibility as to the fact would apparently have no effect on him. He is evidently one of those people who will dispute anything, and contradict anyone, like a man I knew who contradicted even death (for he was not dying, not he) till death came along and contradicted him.

He says that the egg-laying species, like the American black-snake (and he makes no exceptions), are never seen in company with their young, which are never found inside of them (so far as *he* knows), and that they abandon their eggs

* Dated February 22d, 1873.

when laid, and that it would be impossible for them to recognize their progeny, even if aware of the probable period of hatching, and that their services are not needed to protect their offspring or feed them. It would have been interesting if he had told us how he learned all that, or how most of it could be ascertained by any one. Let the reader imagine a person in the sheerest wantonness doggedly maintaining the opposite of what a hundred men could testify to, and he will have a good illustration of the action, and what seems to be the character, of this one. He goes on to say that it is only the class producing "living young," including the English viper and the American rattlesnake, to which attaches the idea of swallowing their young; whereas the popular belief in America is that "snakes," without regard to species, do it, while there are few neighbourhoods in which one if not several people cannot be easily found who can testify to it as a fact, and very few indeed from whom something about snakes cannot be learned. In *Rees' Cyclopædia* we find the following:—"Palisot Beauvois thus relates the fact we allude to: Having perceived a rattlesnake at some distance, I approached as gently as possible, when on lifting my hand to strike her, she sounded her rattle, opened her mouth, and received into it five small serpents, about the size of a quill. I retreated and concealed myself, when the animal, thinking the danger at an end, opened her mouth and let out her progeny. When I appeared again, they immediately took to the same retreat." The editor adds: "He had heard this fact from American planters, and it has been since confirmed by other travellers." D. says: "If there is one marked peculiarity in the race generally, it is the extreme slowness with which they swallow." Certainly, when they take in an animal twice or perhaps three times their own width. "Is there any special adaptation in the gullet of the viper that enables it to swallow, on an emergency, with lightning rapidity?" I dare say, none is necessary to enable an average-sized rattlesnake to swallow young "about the size of a quill." The Frenchman doubtless under-estimated their size, owing to the distance (short as it might have been) and the extreme quickness of the creatures, that would prevent an accurate idea being formed of their dimensions. I am not aware of the throat of a snake having been examined to see whether it could allow an instant passage for her young. There is nothing to justify us in supposing it could not, especially at the time nature calls for it. If a throat were examined, it should be that of a snake that was alleged or supposed to have swallowed her progeny.

I pick up reliable information on the subject of snakes by simply making casual inquiries among people with whom I am or get acquainted. One gentleman killed on Staten Island an adder, that was very full about the body, and he put his foot on her head, and with a stick pressed her towards the tail, and forced twenty-one eggs out of her. They had the ordinary softness and apparent strength of snakes' eggs, and the same colour—a creamy or dirty white — but showed a darkish substance or body inside, as seen through a dull transparency, doubtless the young well on towards maturity; but unfortunately the eggs were not opened to see what the contents were. This opinion is strengthened by the fact that eggs taken out of the same species by another acquaintance did not present the same appearance, owing doubtless to the fœtus not being developed in them to the same extent. It was about the 15th July, that the eggs were

pressed out of the adder, and about the 1st August (but not the same year) the same gentleman saw, about twenty feet from him, another adder and five or six young ones (there might have been others inside of her) about six inches long (so far as he could judge), enjoying themselves, when he came suddenly upon them. He at once made for her to kill her, when his hand was immediately stayed by the young ones entering the mother in such a hurry that he could not see the tail of one from the head of another, for they "flew" in, as he expressed it. Immediately after they were taken in, the mother made off and got into a hole near a fence-post, where he could not get her, to his great disappointment, as he wished to take the young ones out of her. Another friend (a lady this time) saw a black-snake swallow her young; and a very respectable-looking and well-off Negro, whom I met in the company of him who saw the adder swallow her young, also saw a black-snake do the same. All these, and others who have testified to similar facts, are willing to make affidavits to that effect. What then become of D.'s remarks about snakes swallowing their young being "mists" and "delusions," and the other incoherent ideas in his communication, which I would not have noticed but for its appearing in *Land and Water*, and also for the reason that it furnishes the opportunity for saying something more on the subject.

I learned the other day that the young of black and brown striped or garter snakes (and most likely other kinds) are found by themselves under stones and stumps of trees, doubtless left there by the mother when she goes out to forage or enjoy herself, relieved of the care of her large progeny. Several people, whom I know intimately, testify to this fact, for they have often found them under stones. On these being lifted, the young snakes (often about the size of new-born ones) are found neatly stowed away, with no room for the old one, and no remains of the eggs from which they were hatched. On being disturbed they at once scatter, if not immediately crushed by the foot or otherwise destroyed. There is no doubt of the extremely young ones being placed there by the mother for a special purpose, and that it is only at times she takes them abroad with her. Excepting for the purpose of hybernating, the only occasions a snake has for a hole is to find shelter from the weather or danger; and she will be more solicitous in that respect when she has young, like the adder mentioned.*

D. advances it as a reason against the mother swallowing her young, the inconvenience of the load she would have to carry, which would be as sound an argument against her shedding her skin, or gorging herself with a meal two and perhaps three times her own width, both of which she does in her usual haunts. I have never met people who saw snakes shed their skins, but many who killed them when gorged with a meal. One I killed with a live frog in its mouth, when it made a feeble effort to escape to cover, pushing its prey before it, and apparently unable and unwilling to relieve itself of its burden. A friend saw, from a window, at a distance of about twenty feet, an adder about thirty inches long moving slowly towards a medium-sized toad, which stood motionless, as if paralyzed, and facing it at about eighteen inches from it. He immediately sought his hat and went outside, but could find no toad. He, however, killed the snake, and took out of it *a* toad, not completely dead, and nearly half-way down its body. The snake made no effort to escape or defend itself, but seemed

* See note at page 10.

torpid; and the time that elapsed could not have exceeded two minutes. As to the inconvenience to a snake from having swallowed her young, it could hardly be greater than in the case of White's viper (or any similar one to be found any summer in England), which, although probably little more than two feet long, yet contained in the abdomen fifteen young ones, the shortest of which was fully seven inches in length; it making little difference whether the young had been swallowed, or had not yet been born, according to White's theory. And that disposes of D.'s assertion that "no competent naturalist has ever found young vipers in the stomach of the mother;" which assertion is as unfounded as his other one, that the "egg-laying American snakes are never found with young inside of them." He further remarks:—"Physiologists say there is no physical obstacle to the supposed habit [of swallowing the young] and the cumulative testimony of many witnesses would compel us to receive it as an established fact." Then why reject it for the odd reason that "experience warns us, on the other hand, of the extreme liability of untrained observers to be misled by preconceived opinions," when such observers have, in almost every instance, no preconceived opinions or theories on the subject—most of them not even the capacity to form them—but narrate merely what they have seen, and in return find their observations not merely doubted, but discredited and disputed by people full of "preconceived opinions," and empirics in natural history.

What reason could any one advance against snakes swallowing their young, beyond the one I have mentioned, viz.: "No sow on the approach of danger receives her infantile grunters inside of her; therefore no snake does it with her young." That the snake receives her young inside of her is a question that should be settled by evidence, as a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions, or theories not being allowed to form part of the testimony. As illustrating how particular I am in such matters, I give the following:—The gentleman that took a toad out of an adder came suddenly on one of a different species, lying in the middle of a road, and killed her, mashing her head and body so as to burst the latter. He turned, at a distance of about fifteen feet, to look at her, when he observed a number of young ones leaving her, some of which he killed. As the mother was thicker and much wider than ordinary, and bloated, while her abdomen, after she was killed, heaved as with something moving inside, there was no moral doubt of the young ones having been inside of her; but as they were not seen to enter and leave her, it should, as a case of swallowing, be decided as "not proven." The mother measured about two feet, and the young ones about five inches.

D. also maintains the old theory, as if *he* knew it to be a fact, that the eggs of vipers are hatched inside, and says that any one who does not know it as a fact is in a "mist." *Chambers' Encyclopædia* speaks of the "eggs *probably* bursting in the act of parturition." Either must be proved to be a fact before being received as such; and if neither can be proved it must be held that the eggs are laid and then hatched. In my paper printed on the 11th January, I gave an argument against their being hatched inside, and I should like to see one in favour of the theory. And if it happens that the "eggs of vipers burst in the act of parturition," it would also be interesting to see an argument in favour of well-grown and active vipers being found inside of the mother, unless they entered her

by the mouth. On the occasion mentioned I described how the egg of a garter snake was hatched on a table, that is, how the snake burst it and uncoiled itself out of it; and I presented to the doubters of vipers swallowing their young the following phenomena:—"If fifteen or twenty eggs, lying along the back of a snake, were hatched inside in the way described, we would have, on a small scale, something worse than an earthquake. Or, imagine the eggs hatched at birth like the bursting of a shell at the mouth of a gun, or sometime after leaving it, and returning to the gun, without being taken into it, and we would have the doctrine of anti-swallowers well illustrated." Chambers says that "the young are produced in the early part of the summer, from twelve to twenty or more at a birth;" while White of Selborne testified that eggs having no trace of fœtus in them were taken out of one about the 27th May, and young ones out of another on the 4th August. If both are right, and the propagation of vipers is uniform as to time, with no second brood, and if the seasons were the same, we could conclude that the eggs come rapidly to maturity; and that White's vipers (upwards of seven inches long) were perhaps six weeks old when forcibly taken out of the mother. I lay it down as an axiom that we must hold that *all* snakes swallow their young, till the opposite can be proved of any particular species of them.

I may add that the United States are a fine field for the study of snakes, as they are still to be found close up to even large cities like New York. They were and are yet numerous around Hoboken, opposite, in the State of New Jersey. "Snake Hill," the site of the county poor-house, got its name from having been a great resort of many kinds of them. The snakes of a harmless kind that annoy the American housewife the most, in some places, are the black and milk species. The first will gobble up the eggs of hens that lay, or "steal their nests," in the woods, or the chickens so hatched that become wild after some time, requiring trouble to reclaim them, like kittens born in a stable or where they cannot be seen and handled. The other snake is said to steal into the premises and drink the milk; hence its name. Snakes seem loth to go into winter quarters, and apparently resort to expedients to delay it. On the railroad, close up to the petroleum dock at Weehawken, near where Burr shot Hamilton, they have been found lying along the rails and sometimes across them, for the heat of the sun concentrated on the iron, when the train would come quickly along and cut in two those lying across the rails in a partly lethargic state. As the season approaches its close they are easily killed in the woods. Four men, one of whom I am acquainted with, set out one day on a nutting expedition in the neighbourhood, but not succeeding in that, turned it into snake-hunting. In a short time they killed thirty-six, comprising black and garter snakes, and another species the name of which they did not know. They found them all basking on the warmest spots, and more or less near each other as regards species. A snake's winter den is often discovered by a straggler going late to it. On one occasion a den, under the root of a tree, was found in this way. By the count it contained seventy snakes, torpid and "lumped up" together, in about the following proportions: black, 4; adder, 2; and garter, 1. Another den contained about thirty, but mostly adders. Sometimes a snake is overtaken by the winter and frozen in the woods. A son of the Negro I have mentioned, when bringing "brush" into the house for kindling or "brightening" fires,

included in the lot a fine piece, a little like a black walking-stick; and very soon thereafter his mother was like to go into convulsions owing to a snake being in the house and acting like Æsop's viper, which caused the husband great surprise before he managed to see how it had got there at that time of the year.

SNAKES CHARMING BIRDS.*

I HAVE frequently noticed paragraphs in American newspapers on snakes charming birds, but I never witnessed the phenomenon, nor incidentally met one who had, perhaps from the subject of snakes not being alluded to, till lately, when the fact came up on that question being discussed. One of the parties is an acquaintance of sixteen years' standing, and the other the father of another, both thoroughly reliable, and unknown to each other.

The first, when "gunning" in the woods, about the middle of September, had his attention arrested by a bird, evidently in great distress, chirping and hovering close to the top of a bush nearly nine feet high, with a clear stem of from three to four feet. It seemed to be attracted by some object, which turned out to be a snake, whose head protruded at times from among the leaves, and was within twelve or fifteen inches of the bird, which kept gradually but steadily approaching it, when the snake was shot, and the bird flew away. The other gentleman, when passing, in June, along a road having an abruptly-falling wooded slope at the side of it, noticed, on a little lower level than himself, a bird pretty well out on a branch of a tree (having a clear stem of about eight feet, and about ten inches in diameter), chirping and fluttering, and moving from side to side; and facing it, on the same branch, towards the trunk, at about twenty inches from it, was a snake, moving its head in a similar way. On a piece of wood being thrown at them, the snake came down the tree, and the bird flew off.

In both instances the snakes were of the black species, about four feet long, and the intended prey catbirds (about the size of an English thrush), so called from their cry somewhat resembling that of a cat. The impulse one has on meeting a snake is to avoid it or kill it. But in a case like the present, a naturalist would have "become a party to the suit," by quietly approaching as near as possible and patiently seeing the thing through, and then killing the snake. And that could have been easily done, for the two said that the birds and snakes were so engrossed as to seem unconscious of their presence, and did not move till actually disturbed. The first was within about ten feet and the other about twenty feet of the scene, and paused about two minutes before they realised what was passing before them. The circumstance of the snakes and birds being of the same species respectively, should enable us to judge of part of the phenomenon by comparison. In the first case there was no nest on the tree to attract the bird to it, and most likely none in the second; and there can be no doubt that the birds were

* Dated April 2d, 1873; printed May 3d.

on the trees when the snakes climbed up to them and began their charming, the various stages of which are unfortunately left to the imagination. Neither gentleman could see the "countenance" of the reptile, which doubtless presented to its victim a yawning abyss that threw out forked lightning, and had a glowing coal on each side of it, sufficient to paralyse any simple bird. Very probably the snakes on climbing the trees had first amused the birds by their serpentine movements, and gradually magnetised them, like the one on the outer part of the branch, till, perhaps, making a premature effort to seize its prey, it drove it off the tree in the other case, which did not break the spell, for the bird most probably returned to its charmer, and if left alone would very soon have dropped into its mouth. The shot and the throwing of the piece of wood, however, completely broke the enchantment.

The general nature of such a phenomenon, doubtless, somewhat resembles that of a timid person suddenly encountering a large and ferocious beast from which there is no escape, and rushing towards it in the frenzy of the moment, after the nature of a nightmare. This characteristic of the snake catching its prey is doubtless the most wonderful one to be found within the range of natural history, and illustrates that she is, in the language of the Scriptures, "more subtile than any beast of the field;" and is a proof, besides that of her peculiar way of taking care of her young, that she has received from the Creator a large amount of wisdom and understanding. I think I have seen notices of her also charming rabbits, squirrels, and other animals that she could not easily seize in the ordinary way; and that is not unlikely to be the case with at least partly-grown animals. She has no occasion, however, to "cast her glamour" over the frog, for she can easily catch it, giving occasion to a great noise on the part of the victim, which attracts people acquainted with her peculiarities in that respect, and leads to her destruction, although the noise of the frog ceases as it resigns itself to its fate. The snake is a dainty creature in regard to her feeding, for she must catch what she eats; and so particular is she about the freshness of her food that she swallows it alive, except in the case of the constrictor, which first crushes it in her folds and then swallows it.

MR. BUCKLAND ON ENGLISH SNAKES.*

IN the first series of Mr. Buckland's *Curiosities of Natural History*, page 229, New York edition of 1864, I find the following:—"However, though bats don't lay eggs, snakes do. They are generally deposited in a long string connected together by a sort of viscous matter. I have seen as many as thirty in one string. The mother generally deposits them in a dunghill or heap of decaying vegetable matter, and gives herself no more concern about them." It would be interesting to know how Mr. Buckland arrived at that conclusion, that is, how he knew that the mother "gave herself no more concern about them," but left the young to come into the world and take care of themselves in the best way they

* Dated May 28th, 1873; printed June 14th.

could. Has the common English snake, while in a state of nature, never been seen with her young? Or has no one had one which had a progeny when in captivity, to know how the young are hatched, and whether the mother shows no concern in regard to them? It is possible that evidence on these points cannot be found in either of these ways, but it would not on that account follow that the mother's labour was only to lay the eggs and cover them up. Mr. B. says she deposits the eggs in "a dunghill or heap of decaying vegetable matter," without saying how far from the surface, and how covered up. This snake, I presume, is not, and cannot be, either a digger or scraper, like the turtle when she deposits her eggs in the sand, or when she hybernates; which peculiarity is also shown by the young as they leave the eggs. How, then, do the young snakes emerge from the stuff that surrounds, and, doubtless, covers them? According to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, crocodiles "are oviparous, and bury their eggs in the sand, and the female remains in the vicinity to dig them up on the day that the young ones break the shell;" and of the St. Domingo crocodile it says:—"At the time of the escape of the young, the female comes to scrape away the earth and let them out. She conducts, defends, and feeds them by disgorging her own food for about three months." And, according to Audubon, the female alligator watches near the spot where her eggs are deposited, covered with rubbish and mud, and leads the young to the lake. In the propagation of fish we can easily understand why the mother leaves the eggs to their fate; and the same may be said in regard to some insects and the frog family, on account of the various stages of development through which they pass, and also for the reason of the immense number of eggs laid, which would prevent the mother taking care of them all. But the English snake, large as her progeny sometimes is, is doubtless perfectly able to act the part of a mother to them, like the adder and the American snakes, which take care of their young, even receiving them inside of them. Besides, the English snake, like them, deposits her eggs in her habitat, and is never far from them; and the natural conclusion would be, that she visits her nest and removes, or helps to remove, the matter surrounding the eggs, and takes the young under her care for a time, however short. Does anyone know, *for certainty*, that she does *not* do so?

What Mr. Buckland says of the English snake applies well to those in America. "The shell of the egg is of a beautiful white colour, like a common hen's egg, and feels like a very soft white kid-glove. If we cut open these eggs just before they are hatched, the young snakes will come out quite lively and attempt to escape. I tried this experiment last summer." It is very unlikely that American snakes should take the great care they do of their young, while the English one does nothing further than lay the eggs. The American snakes are doubtless "in at the birth," and assist on the occasion, for how else could they mother the progeny? Would they likely do that with any covey of young snakes that might come in their way? I gave, on a former occasion, an instance of a man on Long Island killing an old snake (doubtless the mother) which kept hovering about a nest of eggs at the point of hatching, which he found in a fence when repairing it.

Mr. Buckland also says:—"I have been credibly informed that a gentleman, fond of natural history, while taking a ramble on the coast of Essex, killed a viper full of eggs. He took out his penknife and let out a string of eggs fourteen in

number. In each of these was a young adder, perfectly formed, and enveloped in a glutinous fluid. The little creatures, although they had never seen the light before, raised themselves up and evinced an inclination to bite." These eggs were apparently ready, or nearly ready, to be laid, or the young hatched, although "enveloped in a glutinous fluid" after being taken out of the eggs, having thus two coverings, as the description would imply. They differed in that respect from those taken by White of Selborne out of another, which were not enveloped in anything; and which makes it remarkable that he was not struck with the phenomenon of a "string of eggs" changing into an "abdomen crowded with young upwards of seven inches in length;" and could see nothing in it but that "some snakes are actually born alive, being hatched within the body of the mother." This still leaves the question an open one, whether the eggs of the viper are hatched inside or outside of the mother, or in the act of parturition. Mr. Buckland does not say how long the young vipers were, nor the time of year found, to compare them with White's, which were taken out on the 4th August.

The evidence in regard to the hatching of the turtle, or sea-tortoise, would seem to be that the mother is not present on the occasion, but leaves the young to themselves, although in Figuier's *Reptiles and Birds* we find the following:—"Under the fostering care of their mother those which have escaped the birds of prey on their way to the sea." The same point, I think, requires to be definitely settled in regard to river, land and mud tortoises, which live, deposit their eggs, and hybernate in the same locality, as distinguished from the sea-tortoise, which swims many hundreds of miles from land, and, so far as known, does not hybernate, for the apparent reason that its tropical or semi-tropical habitat does not require it.

---

*MR. GOSSE ON THE JAMAICA BOA SWALLOWING HER YOUNG.**

MR. GOSSE, in his *Naturalist's Sojourn in Jamaica*, 1851, page 314, in describing the yellow boa in that island, says that it commonly attains a length of eight or ten feet, and a diameter of two and a half inches in the thickest part of the body, and alludes to others of the lengths of six and nine feet by measure. All his authorities—black as well as white—agree that this snake lays eggs, and hatches them by incubation, which he proved by personal experiment. Six eggs were brought to him, which were taken out of a large chamber, well lined with trash, in the centre of a low but wide heap of pulverised earth, in which the yam tuber is planted, discovered by the snake crawling out of a hole in the side of it just wide enough to admit her. These eggs were "long oval, 1½ in. by ½ in., plump when first discovered, but now, through exposure to the air, shrunken in at the sides." One of them he opened, and found a snake in it, comparatively lifeless, owing, apparently, to the length of exposure to which it had been subjected,

* Dated June 26th, 1873; printed August 30th.

find that the yellow boa, like many other serpents, is a "swallower;" but they should bear in mind that a naturalist cannot be too full and circumstantial, exact and logical, in his information, to make it of any use in settling a question like the one under consideration.

AMERICAN SNAKES.*

PROFESSOR G. BROWN GOODE, of the University of Middletown, Connecticut, caused a notice to appear in an Agricultural Paper, having a wide circulation in the United States, asking for information on the subject of snakes swallowing their young.† I have a letter from him, dated "Headquarters U. S. Fish Commission, Peak's Island, Portland, Maine, July 21st, 1873," in which he says: —"I have in my possession over fifty letters from all parts of the United States giving the testimony of persons who have not only found the young in the throat of the parent, but have seen them run into her mouth. I am not getting up a formal discussion of the subject, but am thinking of reading a short paper at the meeting of the American Association, next month. I find that many of our naturalists seem determined not to believe in it, yet I cannot but think that the evidence sustains our side. May I use your name, if necessary, in connection with this question? Professor Sydney J. Smith, of the Sheffield Scientific School, Yale College, assures me that he has seen the act, and believes with us. I will return your papers at an early date."

It has often occurred to me that the female snake must have two throats—one for ordinary purposes and the other to give a passage to her young, or one throat for a certain length, leading by a valve, as it were, to another that enters the chamber that contained the eggs, and which doubtless becomes the receptacle of the young when hatched. It will be difficult to find this passage unless when it is in use, for it will become so contracted at other times as to escape any observation that is not very minutely made. Mr. Goode speaks of the young being found in the *throat* of the parent, which is evidently a slip in a hasty note, for it is in the *body* they take refuge—apparently in the chamber that contained the eggs, which, as I said on a former occasion, appears to be distinct from the stomach proper.

AMERICAN SCIENCE CONVENTION ON SNAKES.‡

ON the 23d July I informed you that Mr. G. Brown Goode, of Middletown University, Connecticut, had received many letters from different parts of the United States, testifying to the fact that snakes swallow their young. The following is an abstract of a paper read

* Dated July 23d, 1873.
† This notice appeared on February 1st, 1873.
‡ Dated September 10th, 1873.

by him before the Science Convention at Portland, in the State of Maine, as taken from the *New York Tribune*, of the 27th of August:—

"ON THE QUESTION 'DO SNAKES SWALLOW THEIR YOUNG?' BY G. BROWN GOODE, OF MIDDLETOWN UNIVERSITY, CONN.

"This paper discussed the habit observed in certain snakes of allowing their young a temporary refuge in their throats, whence they emerge when danger is past. He stated that the question had been a mooted one since the habit was first discussed by Gilbert White in his 'Natural History of Selborne,' published in 1789. Reference was made to the views of Sir William Jardine, M. C. Cooke, and Prof. F. W. Putnam, as well as to the recent discussion of the subject in *The London Land and Water*.

"The question can only be decided by the testimonies of eye-witnesses. Through the courtesy of the editors of *The American Agriculturist*, a note was inserted asking for observations. By this means and by personal inquiry the testimony of 96 persons has been secured. Of these, 56 saw the young enter the parent's mouth, in 19 cases the parent warning them by a loud whistle. Two were considerate enough to wait and see the young appear when danger seemed to be past, one repairing to the same spot and witnessing the same act on several successive days. Four saw the young rush out when the parent was struck; 18 saw the young shaken out by dogs, or running from the mouth of their dead parent; 29 who saw the young enter, killed the mother and found them living within, while only 13 allowed the poor parent to escape; 27 saw the young living within the parent, but as they did not see them enter, the testimony is at least dubious.

"It may be objected that these are the testimonies of laymen, untrained and unaccustomed to observation. The letters are, however, from a very intelligent class of farmers, planters, and business men—intelligent readers of an agricultural magazine. In addition, we have the testimony of several gentlemen whose word would not be doubted on other questions in zoology. There were given the statements of Prof. S. J. Smith, of Yale College, Dr. Edward Palmer, of the Smithsonian Institution, the Rev. C. L. Loomis, M.D., of Middletown, Conn., and others; and the statement of the editor of *The Zoologist* regarding the Scaly Lizard of Europe *(Zootoca vivipara)*, which has a similar habit.

"In the opinion of Profs. Wyman and Gill and other physiologists, there is no physical reason why the young snakes may not remain a considerable time in the dilatable throat and stomach of the mother. The gastric juice acts very feebly upon living tissues, and it is almost impossible to smother reptiles. Toads and frogs often escape unharmed from the stomachs of snakes. If the habit is not protective, if the young cannot escape from their hiding-place, this habit is without parallel; if it is protective, a similar habit is seen in South American fishes of the genera *Arius Bagrus* and *Geophagus*, where the males carry the eggs for safety in their mouths and gill-openings.

"Since many important facts in biology are accepted on the statements of a single observer, it is claimed that these testimonies are sufficient to set this matter forever at rest. The well attested cases relate to the garter snake and ribbon snake *(Eutænia sirtalis* and *saurita)*, the water-snake *(Tropidonotus sipedon)*, the rattlesnake *(Caudisona horrida)*, the copperhead and moccasin *(Ancistrodon contortrix* and *piscivorus)*, the massasauga *(Crotalus tergeminus)*, the English viper *(Pelias berus)*, and the mountain black-snake *(Coluber Alleghaniensis)*. It is probable that the habit extends through all the species of the genera represented, as well as throughout the family of *Crotalidæ*. It is noteworthy that all these snakes are known to be ovoviviparous, while no well attested case occurs among the truly oviparous, milk snakes *(Ophebolus)*, grass snakes *(Liopeltis* and *Cyclophis)*, ground snakes *(Storeria)*, or the smooth black-snakes *(Bascanion constrictor)*. It yet remains to be shown that the habit is shared by egg-laying snakes. Further observations are much needed, as the breeding habits of more than 25 North American genera are entirely unknown.

"Prof. Gill corroborated the statement that there was no physical reason why the habit could not exist, and said that he considered the evidence sufficient to finally decide the matter. He repudiated the popular idea that snakes

are sometimes swallowed by men, and that they live afterward in the stomach; and he was glad of the opportunity of denouncing that common error. One of the members present added to the testimony of the paper his personal evidence that he had seen 'with his own eyes' young snakes entering and issuing from the mouth of an older one."

In this abstract allowance must be made for incorrectness or incompleteness in reporting; still I may make a few remarks on some points contained in it. I said, on a former occasion, that a string of eggs lying along the back of a black-snake appeared to be contained in a roomy chamber distinct from the stomach proper. The young I took out of a garter snake were not lying in a string, like these eggs, but filled up about the middle third of the body, about equally distant from the head and tail—not mixed up in any way with the entrails, but presenting somewhat the appearance of a nest or bag-full of caterpillars found on a tree; if we imagine it of an elongated shape, and the larvæ lying in more than one length longwise. Both the black and garter snakes are beyond question egg-laying or oviparous, and "swallowers," for their eggs have been found in the ground in all stages of maturity, and the young have been seen running into and been taken out of the mother, as I have on more than one occasion mentioned. It thus seems odd to be told in the abstract that "all these snakes [including the garter one] are known to be ovoviviparous, while no well attested case [of swallowing] occurs among the truly oviparous;" and that "it yet remains to be shown that the habit is shared by egg-laying snakes." There is some confusion in the paper itself, or in the abstract made of it, on that head. The real value of it is that it proves that "many kinds of snakes swallow their young," and bears out what I said on a former occasion:—"I lay it down as an axiom that we must hold that *all* snakes swallow their young till the opposite can be proved of any particular species of them." * In this paper allusion is made to the gastric juice of the mother. On the occasion mentioned, I said I was under the impression that she must have two throats, or one with two passages, one passage leading to the stomach proper, and the other to the chamber that contains the eggs, apparently where the young ones take refuge. We are also told that "twenty-seven [people] saw the young living within the parent, but as they did not see them enter, the testimony [as to their having been swallowed] is at least dubious." How could that be doubted if the young were hatched from eggs deposited in the ground? And if the species were *viviparous*, how could a *chain of eggs*, in twenty-seven instances, change into a *stomach full of young*, with no remains of the shells of the eggs from which they were hatched, in the face of so many such serpents having been actually seen to swallow their young, to say nothing of the uncertainty of how or where the eggs were hatched? It would be interesting to know on what authority so many kinds of snakes are classed as *viviparous*. If it is merely because they have been killed with young inside of them, the evidence would not hold good in the face of their swallowing their young. I know no way to determine the fact but by taking the eggs out of the snake and examining their condition; and then there would be the question whether the eggs are hatched inside or outside of the mother, or in the act of parturition. As in mathematics we require to know some things to demonstrate others, so in snakes swallowing their young, it is not necessary for a man

* See page 29.

of science, or common sense, if he will but exercise it, to see it done in order to believe it; but when ocular testimony is added, it sets the question at rest beyond all doubt.

The next thing to be considered is the anatomy of the snake immediately after the birth of her progeny; but that could not be so easily ascertained as that she swallows them.*

CHARLES WATERTON AS A NATURALIST.†

I.

WHAT Charles Waterton said of Humboldt in regard to ornithology applied well to himself in the matter of snakes and other animals. At page 251, *Warne*, 1871, he wrote:—"As for Humboldt, I cannot think of submitting to his testimony in matters of ornithology for one single moment. The avocations of this traveller were of too multiplied a nature to enable him to be a correct practical ornithologist." And he illustrated what White of Selborne said about naturalists generally:—"Men that undertake

* The following short articles appeared in *Land and Water*, on the days respectively mentioned:

"THE VIPER AND ITS YOUNG.—A few days ago, says the *Ulverston Mirror*, Mr. Edward Swainson, Nibthwaite, met with a viper on the eastern side of Coniston Lake, and killed it. Then, observing it to be of unusual thickness about the middle, he put his foot upon the place, thinking that the reptile had recently swallowed a mouse. The pressure brought out *ten* young vipers from the mouth of the old one. Some of them were about five inches long, and some shorter; but all were alive and active, as if they had previously seen the light of day, and had again sought shelter in the parent."—*September 27th*, 1873.

"VIPERS SWALLOWING THEIR YOUNG.—Sir: I observed in your paper of last week—I have not a copy by me, and do not remember the signature—the statement of a correspondent, that having killed a female viper, he placed his foot upon her, and that forthwith *out of her mouth* issued a stream of viperlings. If they came out of the mouth, they must have previously entered it. I wish to ask Mr. Frank Buckland, and I beg for a categorical answer, whether he believe this story or not? If he do, he must recant his often-expressed conviction, that the fact is incredible and impossible. If not, he must be prepared to show that your correspondent, intentionally or otherwise, has stated what is not true.—G. R.

"[I perfectly believe the young vipers were pressed out of the mouth of the mother viper when our correspondent put his foot upon it; but it certainly does not follow that these young vipers had been previously swallowed by the mother; they had never been born. When the foot was placed upon the mother viper they were squeezed out of her mouth.—F. BUCKLAND.]"—*October 4th.*

"VIPERS SWALLOWING THEIR YOUNG.—Sir: In your last impression I begged for an explicit answer from Mr. Buckland, 'Whether or not he believed the statement made by a correspondent that, having killed a female viper and placed his foot upon her, out of her mouth issued a stream of viperlings?' To this he replies that, 'The young vipers were *pressed out* of the mouth of the mother when your correspondent put his foot upon it.' This is not exactly the categorical answer I expected, but I must now ask Mr. Buckland to reconcile this explanation with his statement, repeated in two or three numbers of your paper last year, that the unborn vipers were proved on dissection to be located not in the stomach—with which, of course, the mouth communicates—but in the *abdominal parietes*, a portion of the creature entirely distinct and unconnected with it! It appears to me self-evident that the young vipers, if they came out of the mouth, must have gone in at the mouth. They could not otherwise have reached that orifice. The question, therefore, again resolves itself into one of credibility.—G. R."—*October 11th.*

† Dated August 16th, 1873.

only one district are much more likely to advance natural knowledge than those that grasp at more than they can possibly be acquainted with" (Edition 1833, page 128). What his biographer and editor, Mr. Moore, says of him is very far from the truth, however it might be in regard to birds. "He rarely ventured upon a statement which he had not abundantly verified, and his adversaries were careless observers or book-worms" (p. 129). "In all his pryings into animal ways his accuracy was extreme. To this hour he has not been convicted of a single error" (p. 134). Waterton says:—"Our own snakes here in England are scarcely worth notice so far as their venom is concerned. One species, which I designate under the name of adder, is a harmless little fellow. . . . Our other snake is the well-known viper, armed with two small poison-fangs" (p. 432). To show that these designations are not a slip of the pen, he adds, at page 435:—"We have no vipers in this neighbourhood, but adders are plentiful within the park-wall, where I encourage and protect them." This seems odd, when all admit that adders and vipers are the same serpents. He had more reason than he imagined for writing as follows:—"In taking a retrospective view of what I have written on the nature and habits of snakes, as it differs widely from the accounts which we have already received, I really hesitate to lay these notes before the public" (p. 437). And he might have "hesitated" before publishing the following:—"If they can show that I have deviated from the line of truth in one single solitary instance, I will consent to be called an impostor; and then may the *Wanderings* be trodden under foot, and be forgotten forever" (p. 58). I would not think of taking him at his word, either in regard to his *Wanderings* or *Essays*, for a person may prove very erroneous in his estimate of what he believes to be truth, and very hasty and presumptuous in putting forth for truth that which has no foundation in fact. He informs us that the "common and accepted notion that snakes can fascinate animals to their destruction, by a dead-set of the eye at them, is erroneous, and ought to be exploded. Snakes in fact have no such power" (p. 431). He repeats the idea on another occasion:—"The supposed horridly fascinating power said to be possessed by the serpent, through the medium of the eye, has no foundation in truth" (p. 465). He admits that this is a "common and *accepted* notion." Now, if anything is generally believed of snakes in the United States, it is that of charming, fascinating, magnetising or paralysing animals, and particularly birds, by whatever means it is done. I gave, in *Land and Water*, on the 3d of May last, the testimony of two highly intelligent and credible people on the subject. I find the following in a work, published in Philadelphia and London, in 1823, titled *Manners and Customs of Several Indian Tribes*, by John Dunn Hunter. This man was carried oft by the Indians when very young, and left them when a young man, in consequence of having betrayed their intended treachery to the Whites. Being naturally of excellent parts, he was easily educated, and, being greatly befriended by his own race, published his memoirs, which show truth on the face of every page of them. Of the rattlesnake he says:—"Whenever it *fixes its piercing eyes* on a bird, squirrel, etc., it commences and keeps up an incessant rattling noise until the animal, convulsed by fear, approaches within the reach of its formidable enemy, and sometimes into its very jaws. This, however, is not always the result, for I have repeatedly seen animals thus agitated, and in imminent danger,

make their escape without any intervention in their favour except the recovery of their own powers" (p. 179). The latter half of this account is not very clear; perhaps the appearance of a third party, under certain circumstances, broke the spell. If we turn to *Waterton's Life*, page 51, we will find what was apparently an exact counterpart of this scene in an early stage of it; so that he had witnessed part of the "horridly fascinating power" without being aware of it. In Gosse's *Naturalist's Sojourn in Jamaica*, 1871, we have the following:—"Sam has seen a boa ascend a mango-tree, on one of whose branches a fowl was perching, and when at some distance from the prey, begin to dart out and vibrate its tongue, *its eyes fixed on the fowl*, while it slowly and uniformly drew near; the poor hen all the time intently watching the foe, but without stirring or crying. Help came fortuitously, just as the snake was about to strike, and the fowl was rescued. How strange it is that in widely remote parts of the world we should hear the same statements. Sam has never read what other observers have described about fascination, but he and others affirm, from their own observation, that some such power is exercised" (p. 317). Waterton denied this power or peculiarity in snakes, although he was apparently within a hair-breadth of witnessing it. But how did *he* know that they did *not* have it? Why, by peering into their eyes, he could tell you, and tell you infallibly, that they could not, and therefore did not, have it! He gave it as an opinion that the eyes of snakes are *immovable*, and yet in his *Wanderings* he said that the labarri snake "would appear to keep his eye *fixed on me*, as though suspicious, but that was all" (p. 190). Why could not an immovable eye have a glowing coal kindled up inside of it?

Again, Waterton says:—"The cast-off slough always appears inside out" (p. 432). It would be interesting to know how he learned that as a fact in regard to *all* snakes; or if he could explain how a snake could come out of its skin, turning it "inside out," leaving the scales that covered its eyes in the most perfect and beautiful condition, and the whole skin stretched out, almost as natural as when the snake was inside of it.* Again, he says:—"Properly speaking, all snakes are boa-constrictors" (p. 434). I would ask again, how did he learn that? Did he see every kind of snake catch and swallow its prey, to know whether it was a constrictor or not? When I met a garter snake with a frog pretty well down its throat, feet foremost, and appearing at perfect ease, and killed it, so that the frog hopped away, like any other frog, I could certainly say that *that* snake was not a constrictor in any sense of the word; for a constrictor crushes its prey in almost a moment of time, and then swallows it. W. Gordon Cumming says that he made a daman, a species of water-snake, seven or eight feet long, in India, disgorge a frog which was all swallowed but the head, when the frog disappeared among the weeds. That is a very common occurrence in America. Waterton says that the boa-constrictor "swallows the tortoise alive, shell and all" (p. 186). If he is right, the boa is not always a constrictor, for she could hardly crush the tortoise, and so would "bolt" it as it stood. And it is possible that the snakes that swallow alive may constrict when there is to be a fight for it. These matters simply involve a question of evidence. Surely some information could be procured in English collections of snakes, as to how they shed their skins, and seize and

* See note at page 22.

swallow their prey, while in captivity, however they might do these while in a state of nature.

Waterton says:—"I have been in the midst of snakes for many years; I have observed them on the ground, on trees, in bushes, on bedsteads, and upon old mouldering walls" (p. 440); and adds very strongly:—"I have seen *numberless* snakes retire at my sudden approach, and [in addition to that] I have seen *many* remain quite still until I got up quite close to them" (p. 446), after having, in almost the previous breath, said, "As for snakes, I seldom saw them" (p. 436). And, "when we consider the immense extent of tropical America, and view its endless woods, we are forced to admit that snakes are comparatively few. I have seen more monkeys in one day than I have found snakes during my entire sojourn in the forests. When I did fall in with them (and they were not wanted for dissection), whether they were poisonous or harmless, I would contemplate them for a few minutes ere I proceeded" (p. 432), offering them no molestation. Such evidence as Waterton's on the question before us would not be received in any court of justice, because he contradicts himself as regards the numbers of his snakes, and gives no information in regard to his authorities in support of his assertions. A very safe conclusion to draw would be, that Waterton's pursuit of snakes was to procure specimens to set up, leading to some incidental information about them, which certainly would not justify him in attempting, Pope-like, to speak *ex cathedrâ* on the subject. On his third journey he told us that he collected 230 birds and 2 large serpents, besides a few other animals. His editor says:—"For every observation which Waterton had printed he had made at least a hundred" (p. 134). If this was intended to apply to snakes, it would have been interesting to have seen the ninety-and-nine "observations" which he left in the wilderness of his memory. His information regarding snakes resembled an old Indian's medicine-bag—a collection of odds and ends of no intrinsic value, but of the first importance to him, to give him confidence in his movements and to conjure by, and which it would be sacrilege for any one to touch but himself. And woe would have been to that "closet naturalist" who would have dared to touch *his* medicine-bag in his lifetime. He would have been scalped at once, and skinned at leisure for his temerity.

II.

Charles Waterton died in 1865, aged 83 years. He spent his life in the study of natural history, principally if not almost entirely in ornithology, and the setting up of animals, and particularly birds, which seem to have been the end of his existence, and the breath of his nostrils. He entered upon the family estate of Walton Hall, Yorkshire, when he was 24 years of age, and surrounded part of it with a wall ten feet high, and did everything to carry out his favourite pursuit, giving absolute protection to every kind of animal, foxes and rabbits, I believe, only excepted. It would have argued poorly for him if he had not become an adept in his special studies, even if his genius for them had been of a common order; but he proved an unreliable authority outside of his sphere, and illustrated the truth that if the mind is allowed to run exclusively and for long on one subject, it becomes incapacitated for any other, even if it bears a cognate relation to it. My trouble in proving this as regards Waterton, in addition to what has been considered on the subject of snakes, will be to select material from his Essays, where it lies in profusion. Since I

have the privilege of picking and choosing, I will begin with sunstroke.

He says:—"I am not a believer in what is generally called sunstroke, or *coup de soleil.* To prove this, during several years I went out of the house exactly at twelve o'clock, and stood bareheaded under the heliscentre ray, in latitude six north of the equator, for a quarter of an hour. My companions were terrified for the result. I assured them that I apprehended no manner of danger" (p. 614). An intelligent West Indian informs me that he ran the risk of catching a fever—a modified form of "what is generally called a sunstroke." Sunstroke, however, is little known in the West Indies, perhaps for the reason of the gradual increase and steadiness of the heat, tempered by breezes and the peculiarity of the atmosphere, and not merely because the people expose themselves less than in other places. The same can be said of New Orleans, as distinguished from New York, where it is very common, there being a special hospital for its treatment, while the other public hospitals receive patients, and each police station (which has a surgeon) is prepared to treat cases temporarily. In New York, where the temperature ranges from say 0 to 100, the disease manifests itself in connection with a variety of circumstances, such as fatigue and exposure, weakness or sickness, the weight of the clothes worn, and dissipated habits, particularly among the foreign population. Waterton's system was doubtless in excellent condition for a tropical climate. He ate moderately, and was a total abstainer, and he had a thick head of hair, made thicker by frequent cropping, and very probably a skull to correspond, which he trained for years to an exposure, "while standing at ease," of only fifteen minutes, *going out of the house* with his body in its natural temperature into one described by himself as follows:—"There is seldom an entire day of calm in these forests. The trade-wind generally sets in about ten o'clock in the morning" (*Wanderings, 3d ed.*, p. 171). "During the day the trade-wind blows a gentle and refreshing breeze, which dies away as the night sets in" (p. 225). In opposition to his own theory, he told us, in his *Wanderings*, of his having had "many a fit of sickness brought on by *exposure to the noonday sun, etc.*" (p. 160). Had he told us what his "terrified companions" dreaded, it would doubtless have been a complete refutation of his *hypothesis*, which he said was a *proof* against the existence of sunstroke, or his belief in it. This allusion to sunstroke acts as a key to at least one cell of his character, and lets in daylight upon it. He seems to have neither believed nor disbelieved in moonstroke.

The idea of sunstroke was, singularly enough, tacked on to the question whether the pythoness at London, in 1862, could hatch her eggs. That, of course, he considered, in his usual way, a "granny's idea," notwithstanding that a pythoness hatched her eggs at Paris, about ten years previously, while the London one failed only in consequence of the eggs having, from a variety of causes, become addled, a living serpent having been taken out of an egg at an early stage of the incubation. Ordinary people would think that all snakes would hatch their eggs in that way, if they did not know that the generality of them do not; and that it would not be unreasonable if some of them did, as an intermediary between hatching them in the soil and bringing them far on towards hatching inside of them, and then giving birth to them in a way that is apparently yet to be discovered. Waterton did not seem to be troubled with ideas of that kind; his dogmas covered everything.

If there is an animal in the United States that is known and detested for its peculiarities, it is the skunk. 'Tis in the mouth of almost every one in country places, when a person has behaved ungratefully, abused one's confidence, done a mean action, or been guilty of cheating. According to *Appleton's Cyclopædia*, it is described (and correctly) as follows,—"Though weak, timid, and slow in its motions, it is effectually armed against its most ferocious enemies by an acrid and exceedingly offensive fluid, secreted by two glands whose ducts open near the anus . . . . sufficient to eject the fluid to a distance of fourteen feet. . . . It is a very cleanly animal, and never allows its own fur to be soiled with its secretion. . . . Its flesh is white and fat, and, if properly skinned, in no way tainted by its secretion; it is highly esteemed by the Indians, and is eaten by the Whites in various parts of the country." Appleton says that its secretion has been successfully employed in some forms of asthma, and for other medical purposes. Its grease is used for rheumatism and diseases of the joints. I have known it to be taken from a skunk for such purposes. Now, turn to what Waterton says about this animal, in his essay on the weasel:—"At what old granny's fireside in the United States has the writer of this picked up such an important piece of information? How comes the pole-cat to be aware that the emitted contents of a gland . . . should be offensive to all its pursuers?" (p. 227.) He returns to the question again, and says:—"I cannot refrain from asking by what power of intuition the pole-cat is convinced that a smell, naturally agreeable to itself, is absolutely intolerant to man?" (p. 341.) A queer question for a "naturalist" to ask. "It now and then happens that we are led astray by our feelings when we pronounce judgment on the actions of irrational animals" (p. 341), especially when we are asked to "reject the Transatlantic theory as a thing of emptiness," and agree with Waterton when he says:—"If we are called upon for an opinion as to the real uses of the fœtid gland in pole-cats, let us frankly own that we have it not in our power to give anything satisfactory on the subject" (p. 228). He considered himself an injured man when told he was not a "scientific naturalist," when, by his own confession, he could not settle a question that any old Yankee granny can, in common with the cur that sits on her door-step. Was it like a naturalist of any kind to dogmatize on a subject about which he apparently knew nothing, and characterize another's opinion as a "granny's story," without giving one of his own, or showing that he even had the capacity to form one?

Under the head of "the dog tribe," he says:—"I have heard and read much of dogs and wolves hunting in packs, but believe it not" (p. 202); and, under the head of "the food of animals," he repeats the idea:—"I consider the stories about wolves hunting in packs as mere inventions of the nursery to keep cross children quiet" (p. 471). That wolves hunt in packs all the time is what I should suppose no one will maintain; but that they never, or do not often, do it, would be as contrary to evidence as anything that could be mentioned. A question like that Waterton does not pretend to settle by his own knowledge, nor would he have recourse to that of others, for then he would have become, what he had a peculiar horror for, a "closet naturalist." Said he:—"Whip me, you dry and scientific closet naturalists" (p. 127), and field ones, too, should such be around. "He did not recast the information picked up from books; he did not even

retail the hearsay collected on the spot" (p. 134). He trusted to his "intuitive perceptions," and maintained that wolves hunt singly, for the reason that if they did it in packs they would quarrel over the spoil, and, like the cats of Kilkenny, destroy each other! Again, he says:—"Were wild dogs to hunt in packs, the daily supply of food would not be sufficient to satisfy the cravings of every individual" (p. 203). Now, it holds to reason that if ravenous animals live on flocks in a state of nature, they will follow these flocks, so that they can never lack food as long as the flocks exist; nor do wild flocks, as a general thing, appear to leave their favourite feeding grounds on account of being disturbed or preyed upon by others of the brute creation; and if they did, their enemies would follow them, as in the case of the buffalo and other American animals. The main reason for wolves and such animals hunting in packs, is apparently to combine their strength against such quarry as would take perhaps half a dozen wolves to master, or give them courage or confidence, or when their prey went in flocks for protection. It is unnecessary for me to illustrate at length what I have said, by quoting the evidence of trustworthy travellers, as to certain animals following and killing their prey in packs; and that more than one wild animal can and do eat off the same carcass at the same time; which would be a great saving in the economy of nature, for that particular species, rather than each animal killing its prey and leaving much, if not most, of it to be consumed by others, which would never have it in their power to partake of such fare, if they had to acquire it themselves. In Lewis and Clarke's *Expedition across the Rocky Mountains*, we have many allusions to wolves constantly attending on the herds of buffalo, elk, deer, and antelopes; and the following passage from Hunter illustrates at a glance the relation between buffaloes and wolves:—"The cows bring forth in March or April. They are proverbially attached to their young, and form at night a circular phalanx round them, with their horns outward, to protect them against the attacks of the wolves" (p. 173). But this "founder of a school" for naturalists, in his crusade against "closet naturalists," has the following whimsical objection to animals hunting in packs:—"When at a great distance from their supposed retreat, what master-dog will take upon himself to organize the pack? and when the hard day's hunting is over how will he dispose of his confederates? Are the females, which remained behind on the hunting morning, in order to take care of their newly-whelped pups, supposed to wait in anxious expectation that some generous hound will return with a neck of goat in his mouth for their support?" (p. 203.)

As an instance of his "philosophy," I may give what he says about the apes on the Rock of Gibraltar. Ordinary people would conclude that these were the descendants of others that had escaped from confinement; but *he* scouts the idea. "I believe there is nothing on record to show that this establishment of an apish colony had ever taken place" (p. 144); as if that were likely to have been "put on record," when the escape of two apes, "unbeknown" to any one, could have done all the mischief! He has recourse to the "portentous circumstance" of Europe and Africa being separated by a "tremendous convulsion of nature," which cut off the apes' retreat towards the South, and left a few of them high and dry on the top of Gibraltar; the only place in Europe where they are found, and where they maintain themselves under the

hardships of changes of temperature, wind and weather, and the difficulty of finding food, but where they are secure, undisturbed by anyone. The mountain in labour giving birth to a mouse was truth when compared to the breaking up of the foundations of the earth being necessary to give us in Europe the only wild representatives of these "unlucky mimickers of man!"

I have not by any means exhausted the points to be commented on, for they are scattered in profusion through Waterton's works. I will content myself by presenting, in my next and last paper, a general summing up of his character as a naturalist.

III.

Charles Waterton appeared before the world as a naturalist under the most favourable circumstances. He was the representative of an ancient family, the possessor of a romantic estate, and the owner of comfortable, if not ample, means, and he could have well afforded to let his *Wanderings*, which contained much interesting and valuable information, find their way gradually into public favour, leaving others to defend them against attacks made on them, or defending them himself in a dignified way, avoiding the use of names and epithets. Instead of that, he acted the part of a brawler and bruiser, using language inconsistent with the amenities of a man of business, or the courtesies and instincts of a gentleman. If he had studied a little the natural history of his own species to any advantage, he would have been satisfied to have had his work abused rather than not noticed at all; either of which is the common fate of what adds to knowledge, when something has to make way for it; and he would have presented it to the public in a manner calculated to secure its ear sooner or later. In place of that, he gave an exceedingly ill-arranged, rambling and *wandering* account of his adventures and observations, mixed with many simpering sentimentalisms, trifling egotisms, and pedantic quotations, of no earthly use to a large part of his readers; peculiarities seldom or never met with in a character that is judicious and manly, or really amiable. With no sense of consistency, he spoke of the book as having "little merit," yet quoted a high eulogium passed by Sir Joseph Banks on the first half of it, the other half having been written after his death. In the work he described what he called a nondescript, as regards its habits and capture, giving its likeness in a frontispiece; and urged his readers to visit the scenes of his adventures to procure specimens of the same animal; all, as he afterwards admitted, pure fiction, to gratify his spite against the government for charging him, according to law, a duty of twenty per cent. on the valuation of his collection, if it was for private use, and nothing if intended for a public museum! Taking his own account of the occurrence, he was really well treated by the custom-house. If he had landed fifteen years afterwards, and very probably at that time, a donkey loaded with diamonds, the only duty he would have had to pay was ten shillings for the donkey! A man of the world and a gentleman, knowing from experience what all governments are, and possessed of ample means, would have paid the duty, without any ado beyond making it the occasion of agitating for the abolition of it for the future. Had he been a man occupying the position of that of little better than a beggar in the pursuit of natural history, he would have doubtless received the entire public sympathy; and all the more so had he told us how much the "Hanoverian Rats" had devoured of his substance. Besides giving the *world* the nondescript as a sweet

revenge against the *Lords of the Treasury*, he tells us:—"In fine, it is this ungenerous treatment that has paralysed my plans [robbed him of his available means, so that he could not print an additional dozen pages of MS.?] and caused me to give up the idea I once had of inserting *here* the newly-discovered mode of preparing quadrupeds and serpents." When he found that the public classed other matters in his *Wanderings* with the nondescript, there was no end to his scolding, and almost cursing, every one who even presumed to differ from him. There was so little tact and sense, self-respect and good-breeding manifested at the outset of his public career, at the mature age of forty-three years, and so much that was capricious and whimsical, that little room was left for the display or development of that principle and judgment which, sooner or later, command the respect or confidence of the world.

Any prejudice Waterton may have met with on account of being a Romanist of "many centuries standing" he owed to himself, for the reason that he proclaimed himself such in an unusual and uncalled-for manner, and as having had his mind manipulated from his infancy by the Jesuits—a set of men as offensive to humanity at large, even when they come in the garb of "angels of light," as obnoxious animals are to a barn-yard, where everything having a horn in its head will stick it into them. Notwithstanding the eulogium he passed upon them, as the embodiment of the humane and Godlike virtues, he could not have objected to his own language being applied to them when he wrote:—"It is said, if you give a dog a bad name, whether innocent or guilty, he never loses it. It sticks close to him wherever he goes. He has many a kick and many a blow to bear on account of it." By his own admission, constantly gloried in, he was a black Romanist, dyed in the wool, and doubtless a lay Jesuit, who believed in everything of the system as absolutely as the most ignorant and blinded devotee, native or foreign; and whose particular aversion was for the "Hanoverian Rats," with a "God rest the soul of Charles Stuart." As a naturalist, he seems to have been testy and easily "riled," as well as spiteful and revengeful, self-engrossed and illogical, and in the highest degree pragmatical and dogmatical, presumptuous and arrogant, in matters with which he was evidently little conversant. He says, in writing to George Ord, of Philadelphia, when seventy-three years old:—"We bird-stuffers are a very low set, very jealous of each other, and excessively prone to anger and defamation;" which, like most of his *opinions*, must be received with a good deal of question or qualification. He was constantly abusing what he called "closet naturalists," who drew their information from books, as an illiterate man abuses newspapers, and sneered at "market naturalists" as if they were kitchen gardeners; while in many of his lucubrations he sunk below both, drawing his information, not from books or the conversations of observers, but from his imagination, or the "depth of his consciousness"—occult attributes, very difficult of defining or depending on. Witness, for example, his singular remarks and crude speculations about snakes, skunks, wolves, dogs, the food of animals, and sunstroke.*

* There runs through Waterton's Works a marked aversion to what he called a "closet naturalist," whom he seems to have considered as a natural enemy; but he did not define exactly what he meant by the term. Taking one view of the question, it could doubtless be said that he would have called him a closet naturalist who quoted himself against himself, in any variation or vagary he might have fallen into in his writings.

Charles Waterton, however, seems to have been a distinguished man in his way, that is, as a taxidermist or setter-up of animals, and ornithologist, or in anything of that nature that he actually saw and described; but very unreliable in questions of philosophical inquiry, or that required judgment, in matters relating to natural history. In short, he seems to have been "all sight and no scent," with a blessed ignorance of where the one ends and the other begins. His writings generally are poorly put together, and sometimes sadly mixed with extraneous matter, showing the want of a well-trained and scientific mind; notwithstanding which, his works and life, marred as they are by personalities, however much provoked, and especially his establishment at Walton Hall, will ensure his being well remembered by the lovers of natural history everywhere. He says:—"Most men have some favourite pursuit, some well-trained hobby, which they have ridden from the days of their youth. Mine is ornithology, and when the vexations of the world have broken in upon me, I mount it and go away for an hour or two amongst the birds of the valley; and I seldom fail to return with better feelings than when I first set out" (p. 496). This, and what relates to it, and matters connected with natural history in general, seem to have made up his character, for nothing can be drawn from his writings to indicate that anything else of any importance, beyond his religion, attracted him, except some of the Latin poets, whom he quoted to illustrate his subjects and ideas. Perhaps the influence of the Jesuits is here observable, for the end of their teaching is to stunt or emasculate the mind in its higher faculties, and hold it in subjection, limiting its functions in that respect to one idea, viz: THE CHURCH,* beyond whose teachings all is dangerous and impious speculation.

His editor is anything but free from the bad taste of calling names and indulging in improper language. He should have apologised for Waterton in that respect, rather than imitated him, after the time that had elapsed. He says:—"In fact, Waterton flogged two generations of quacks, and it would be well if a second Waterton arose with a new rod and a larger" (p. 130); never imagining, when penning these words, that he might have been putting one in pickle, to be laid over the back of himself as well as his friend. He seems to have damned him not with faint, but with fulsome praise, calculated to make him enemies rather than friends. He has no right to characterize him as a man of "acute intellect," or a "profound naturalist," or that all "his observations are so accurate that they delight the profoundest philosopher," for the very opposite can be said of many of them. Waterton says:—"I cannot understand how he can make me, at one and the same time, a *very observing* and an *unscientific* naturalist"

* Waterton, in his *Wanderings*, complains of Southey, in his *History of Brazil*, when referring to the Jesuits, making use of the phrase, "Whose zeal the most fanatical was directed by the coolest policy," and adds: "It will puzzle many a clear brain to comprehend how it is possible in the nature of things, that *zeal* the most fanatical, should be directed by the *coolest policy*." If Waterton was sincere in what he said, it would follow that he would have been plucked had he tried to take the degree of "First Wriggler" in the Order.

He mentions with great gusto, how he got the better, in a Jesuitical way, of the prefect at Stonyhurst, who had hunted him for nearly half an hour in grounds forbidden to the boys, and "cornered" him. As a last resource, he got the old brewer to cover him with pigs' litter, just as the official bounced in by the gate through which he had entered. "Have you *seen* Charles Waterton?" said he, quite out of breath. And his "trusty guardian answered, in a tone of voice which would have deceived anybody, 'Sir, I have not *spoken a word* to Charles Waterton these three days, to the best of my knowledge'" (*Warne, p.* 19).

(p. 557). This represented his mental peculiarity. As a general illustration of such a distinction, it may be said that a person may make all observations possible on a complicated subject, and yet be devoid of the capacity or mental training so to weave them into a theory or system, that will immediately, or at any time, meet with acceptance. Waterton was not a "man of science" in the proper sense of the word (whatever he might have been as a taxidermist and ornithologist), so that his editor's words are out of place when he says: "As a man of science, he has never, in my opinion, obtained his rightful place" (p. 133), meaning by that, that he was a "naturalist the first of his own time, and in no age surpassed" (p. 1); and for other reasons than that "he provoked many enemies by his advocacy of truth and exposure of error" (p. 133). "Few things are easier than to feign a hypothesis" (p. 57), but few more difficult than to make one good. Waterton spoke of "Selborne's immortal naturalist," whom his editor alludes to as one of his few favourite English authors. It would have been well had he studied him to more purpose than he did, in two respects at least; that in every branch of natural history, facts are everything, and theories and difficulties nothing, and that among naturalists of the right stock, opprobrious names and abusive epithets should find no place. It is to be hoped that for the future, no one will maintain that Waterton "rarely ventured upon a statement which he had not abundantly verified," or that "in all his pryings into animal ways, his accuracy was extreme," and, above all, that "to this hour he has not been convicted of a single error."

ROMANISM.

WATERTON literally dosed his readers with his Romanism, which makes it a subject of legitimate comment here. Let almost any religion of purely human origin, with a regular priesthood, become established and acquire a history and traditions, and hardly any reasonable means can extirpate it, although it may disappear when its followers, uninfluenced from without, quarrel among themselves, and, as in the case of Mahometanism, move like an avalanche, carrying with it every object in its course. The less reason a devotee has for believing in the origin and truth of such a religion, the greater seems the difficulty in getting him to renounce it, particularly among Asiatic races, and as was illustrated in the fall of Paganism in Europe. That natural adhesion becomes amazingly strengthened in the case of Romanism, the most subtle and successful, the best organized, and apparently the most permanent of religions of corrupt human nature, based on certain scriptural truths, or some of their aspects, and innumerable superstitions, that took possession of an originally divine building, or the framework of it, and turned it into another structure, and applied it, with its traditions and associations, for the most part, to other purposes and towards other objects than the original ones. By systematically and perseveringly stimulating and manipulating the religious instincts and faculties from their very birth, it has taken a transcendent hold on

the imagination and obedience of its followers, notwithstanding the clouds of witnesses—moral and intellectual, historical and biblical—that surround it, and question, dispute and disprove all its peculiar dogmas. It is then no wonder that Romanists should remain Romanists (for a religion of some kind, coming to them from without, they must have) when men of the greatest candour, diligence, and capacity have had to undergo a struggle somewhat like a convulsion in nature, before they could break the spell that bound them, and a similar struggle in acquiring a new faith, both taking place at the same time, and frequently leaving the person a roaring infidel. Little chance, therefore, is there of such impulsive and illogical, and, in some respects, weak-minded men (to say nothing of women) like Waterton, by their own efforts or the assistance of others, being apt to renounce the faith in which they were carefully reared before their earliest recollection, under the impressive influence of the absolute submission of their parents, and the ghostly nature of the priests' instruction and ceremonial, and embrace another which holds as an abomination that which they formerly worshipped, in the face of the wonderfully efficient means used by the priests in looking after their "sheep," and guarding them against the "wolves," which, of course, include everything outside of their fold.

Here we have the most absolute obedience and belief in THE CHURCH, whatever it may teach, and the consequent safety in the other world, by virtue of paying dues, and discharging easily performed duties, and making confession and receiving absolution from time to time, and especially at the hour of death, at the hands of the visible, audible, and tangible being with whom the devotee has to do, perhaps his own child or near relation. Romanism, by captivating the senses, with its seductive music, incense, and gorgeous ceremonial, and forms of worship generally, and particularly the mass and confession, and absolution, that enthrall the soul, becomes part of his nature, which he will not and cannot doubt any more than he would his own existence, or that of the amulets on his person to keep him constantly reminded of being a "son of the Church;" but if such a thought is entertained it becomes a heinous offence, that requires a corresponding penance before it can be forgiven. The very essence of his religion is to believe and receive everything taught by his Church, and close his ears against everything to the contrary. In short, the worshipper is passive in the hands of the priest, who undertakes everything for him on his yielding implicit obedience to his commands, as those of the Church; and the priest becomes to him the door-keeper of heaven, without whose permission there is no admittance.

On the other hand, we have the priest so far raised above every dignity known to man that even kings in secret grovel at his feet, and receive from him pardon and a passport to purgatory, or have them withheld, or rendered of no effect even if given, according to the intention or inattention of the priest when pronouncing them, or the quality, reality or completeness of the confession;* and there they remain till released by the alms and suffrages of the faithful paying for masses for their deliverance; which masses will be

* The following passage of Scripture should have some meaning in connection with the every-day confession of a Romanist to his priest, on the strength of which he is absolved, and placed in the position of never having sinned :—

"Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death." —2 Cor. vii. 10.

said as long as they are paid for, for the Church does not *publicly* profess to know or teach when souls are released, and passed to a state of final happiness. In virtue of his consecration, which separates him from all earthly relations, the priest becomes a member of a world-wide caste, that is exalted above any order that can be conceived, and that secures him provision for life, almost as if he were independent of Providence for a sustenance; as well as immunity against arrest or punishment by any person or power outside of the Church, where Romanism is completely in the ascendant. Even if raised from the dunghill, he is yet eligible to the office of our "sovereign lord the Pope," who is "above all principalities and powers;" and although filling an humble position in the Church, and yielding implicit obedience to his superiors, he can confess and pardon even that superhuman dignitary, as if, in short, he were a part of the Godhead itself; for priests confess and pardon priests on all occasions, no less than the most ignorant devotees. And let anyone wallow in the mire every day of his life, he can go to the priest and make confession and receive forgiveness, paying, of course, a fee on the occasion. The most memorable events in the lives of priests, before or after consecration, are the first sin they pardoned, and the first wafer they converted into a god to be worshipped. This "mystery of iniquity" is propagated, bodily and mentally, from age to age, and becomes the daily life, and hope for happiness in a future state, of countless millions; and the dignified sacerdotal position in society, as well as the "bread and butter," of the principals, managers, or governors, with no apparent prospect of it ever coming to an end. And not only that, but it makes converts among ritualists, and that floating part of the population, of both sexes and all ages and classes, that, in the language of St. Paul to Timothy, are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth;" and (which is not so surprising) among those who have little more knowledge of religion than the instinct of nature—"that intellectual and emotional want that is as common to man as instinct is to the brute creation for the ends which it has to serve."*

Every religion of which we have any knowledge, except what has been revealed in the Scriptures, seems to have sprung from the exercise of this natural instinct, which was doubtless accompanied originally by a revelation. So deep is the darkness and mystery surrounding the origin and degradation of religion, and the innumerable forms of worship and superstition to which they gave birth, that we may dismiss the questions from contemplation so far as they could illustrate any one, in whole or in part, known to us, except in the matters of sacrifice and prayer. But even these are worthy of little regard, inasmuch as in the cases of the enlightened Greeks and Romans, St. Paul tells us that "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils (demons) and not to God" (1 Cor. x. 20). And the prayers which accompanied their sacrifices, as well as their supplications in general, no matter how sincere they were, doubtless went in the same direction—certainly to beings that existed only in the imaginations of the worshippers; as illustrated by Plato—the divine and godlike Plato—when he said, "Let us pray," and thus began: "O Pan, and ye other gods of this place;" and by Socrates when he said, "Crito, we owe a cock to Æsculapius; pay it, and by no means neglect it." God did not altogether abandon men to themselves, "for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly

* Disquisition on the Gipsies, p. 502.

seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom. i. 20). "Nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our heart with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 17), although "in times past he suffered all nations to walk in their own ways" (verse 16), "because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things, wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness" (Rom. i. 21–24). "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind . . . . who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them" (verses 28 and 32), yet holding them to accountability, "for when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." (Rom. ii. 14, 15).

Here we have the human mind, while possessing its wants and natural instincts intact, presenting a vacuum in regard to religious knowledge, into which an impostor or enthusiast could force his way, but with much difficulty, and keep possession through the religion he introduced, till dispossessed by some other; the devotions or whims, wants or vices of its members, the growth of a priesthood, and the nature of their organization, doctrines and ceremonies, and the manner in which these were presented to the worshippers, the lapse of time, and the political or social convulsions of society, as well as the corruption or abuse of the religion itself, such as it was, influencing the question of a faith, taking or keeping possession of a people where a revelation was not given, or brought to bear upon them.

Many of the religions of human nature doubtless had their origin in "the spontaneous and gradual growth of superstition and imposture, modified, systematised, adorned or expanded by ambitious and superior minds, or almost wholly in the conception of these minds." * How a religion or form of worship might have had its origin is illustrated in the adventure of Paul and Barnabas among the rude people at Lystra, when they would have rendered divine honours to them as Jupiter and Mercury, but for the objection that was made; when the priest of Jupiter, apparently rushing in on the top of the wave, to be ahead of the people, and the master of ceremonies, "brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people" (Acts xiv. 13), although he would doubtless have been just as ready to head them in slaying the Apostles, had the current run in that direction.† How a religion has

* Disquisition on the Gipsies, p. 502.

† The other instance when St. Paul was taken for a god was on the island of Melita or Malta, when a viper fastened on his hand as he laid a bundle of sticks on a fire. The barbarous people present immediately concluded that, having just escaped shipwreck, he must have been a murderer, whom vengeance would not suffer to live. "But after they had looked a great while, and saw no harm come to him [for 'he shook off the beast into the fire and felt no harm'], they changed

been established in modern times, in the memory of people hardly past the middle of life, is illustrated by Mormonism, which has a much greater hold upon its followers than the world is aware of, or willing to believe.

The conclusion to be drawn would be, that human nature was formerly, as it is now, capable of inventing a religion, and setting up a worship, and establishing a priesthood, manufacturing it out of nothing, as it were, having everything to seek where nothing was to be found, except the natural instinct of man to receive, and the faculty to act on, what was presented to it. Why, then, could not that self-same human nature, as it got gradually converted to or absorbed in it, and then born into it, take an actual revelation, complete in itself, and applying to this life and the next, and create from or out of it a religion and worship completely its own, but much superior to common Paganism, using its facts, ideas and phrases only to twist and pervert them to "other purposes and towards other objects than the original ones," and adding "innumerable superstitions" to it; so that it became a religion of nature, or Paganism, which its followers would afterwards even fight for, as "the faith of their ancestors," or maintain it for contention or filthy lucre's sake, or make it supply the place generally filled by all the religions known among men? When such a revelation had been perverted, God could with much more reason and justice not merely "give them over to a reprobate mind," as he did the heathen, but "send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 11, 12).*

We read of the Apostles healing people or striking them dead, or bringing them to life again (which no priest will attempt to do), but never of their having pardoned their sins, for the apparent reason that God alone does that with the really penitent and believing; while the other gifts, being visible and tangible acts, obvious to every one, would serve the purpose of advancing the religion preached, which the pardon of sins could not do, and was therefore foreign to the mission of the Apostles, as applicable to any other offences than those connected with church discipline. But the fountain for the washing away of sins as against God, claimed by a priest, ignorant and immoral as he sometimes is, never runs dry or freezes, particularly while the applicant's money holds out; while St. Peter

their minds, and said that he was a god" (Acts xxviii. 1–6).

Deification among the Pagans seems to have been a common occurrence, but it was only that of the true benefactors of mankind that took root and flourished. It was the rule among the heathen emperors of Rome, extending sometimes to members of the imperial family. Thus Tacitus says that Tiberius forbad the "forms of religious worship" at the funeral of his mother, Livia, the widow of Augustus; which was unnecessary, as "it was her desire not to be deified." Claudius, however, rendered her "divine honours," as related by Suetonius. And a daughter of Nero, dying before she was four months old, we are told by Tacitus, "was canonised for a goddess: a temple was decreed to her, with an altar, a bed of state, a priest, and religious ceremonies."

* This seems to have been the "natural history" of man:—First, we have the race, with the exception of Noah and his family, destroyed by the flood (Gen. vi. 5–8), without apparently improving it; next, the confusion and scattering of it at Babel; then the Jews—who "received the law by the disposition of angels and did not keep it"—dispersed over the earth, for their wickedness; and lastly, the way in which the Christian Revelation was sooner or later treated. All these cast a certain light over the "darkness and mystery surrounding the origin and degradation of religion, and the innumerable forms of worship and superstition to which they give birth."

scorned to accept money to confer a Christian grace, with the words, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money" (Acts viii. 20). Nor did he pardon any one, for he said, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and *Pray God*, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee" (verse 22). Nor would he allow any one to fall down at his feet, for he raised Cornelius from that position, saying, "Stand up; I myself also am a man" (Acts x. 26). Nor would Paul and Barnabas, on the occasion mentioned, allow the same to be done, for we are told that when the people would have rendered them divine honours, as understood among heathens, "they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein" (Acts xiv. 14, 15). While St. Peter permitted no one to fall down at his feet, but made him stand up, his so-called successor allows and expects, if he does not command, even the kings of the earth to kiss his foot, or rather his big toe, as well as that of the statue of "Blessed Peter."* And, although no one doubts that a living lion is better than a dead dog, Romanists "worship the Saints," who for anything they know never were saints, some of them being of doubtful, others of hateful character, and some of them never having had any existence as saints or sinners. And it is partly through the merits and intercession of such uncertain beings that Romanists expect to get to heaven. Not content with that, they will not even let their bones rest in peace, or the rags that covered them while on earth or in the tomb, but use them (or substitutes for them) for conferring benefits on the living; while they pray to the supposed saints in heaven, imagining that they can hear and attend to the wants of countless millions at the same time, as if they were omnipresent and omniscient, and therefore gods. The Apostles would receive no veneration or worship from any one while on earth, for they were engaged in too holy a cause, and were of too elevated character to look for that, or approve of it after death, or perhaps even give a thought to the estimation in which they would personally be held among men.

We are told in the Scriptures that the Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," that is, on what they taught, "Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner-stone" (Ephes. ii. 20); but Romanists tell us that Peter had length and breadth and thickness on which to erect the whole Church, past, present, and to come! A sorry foundation "Blessed Peter" was on which to build anything. Although possessed of many eminent qualities, he was forward, hasty and presumptuous, and much of a braggadocio—having "given up his all," perhaps "an old cobble boat and a rotten net," to follow his master; often open to reproof and correction, and apt to get his company into trouble, yet, like the rest, a runaway when real danger presented itself. Three times, with cursing and swearing, did he deny his master, who at one time ordered him, as Satan, to get behind him, like a dog that had been spoken to. After the ascension, he so trimmed and shuffled on a question that should have been

* It is interesting to notice the light in which the old Pagans would have regarded such an act of homage, if rendered to one of their emperors; for, says Plutarch:—"If you were commanded to kiss Cæsar's feet, you would think it an outrage and an excess of tyranny. What else is this than slavery?"

met in a manly way, that Paul "withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii. 11), for being a "dissembler," and as guilty of "dissimulation" (verses 11–16). He unquestionably occupied the position of priority, and priority only, at first, but afterwards, as his character or capacity developed itself, a secondary one, that of a servant, messenger or deputy, in carrying out his colleagues' decisions; and then he became the Apostle to the Jews. And was it on this rolling stone that the Church was built, and through whom the Pope claims to be infallible in faith and morals, in virtue of merely being his so-called successor as *bishop* of Rome, when no positive evidence can be shown that "Blessed Peter" ever was at Rome, and much to show that he never was bishop of it? In all their allusions to their Church, Romanists never mention the Greeks, for the reason that they are heretics and schismatics from that Church, that is, according to their theories, from *the* Church, having broken away from it when they formed about a third of its numbers, after having been founded and, as it were, colonized by it, the mother Church in which Christianity altogether had its origin and was developed; and from which they separated, as the United States parted from their mother country, but under somewhat different circumstances.

Never, in all my conversations with Romanists, could I get one of them to enter upon that subject, or even allow it to be discussed, for the reason that they can advance no argument in proof of their own legitimacy; but they are very brave when the question is between Rome and the rest of the West, while they will scowl when the Eastern Church is mentioned to them.

The Pope should be required, in legal phraseology, to "prove his pedigree" on the following points:—

1st. Was St. Peter in any way infallible, that is, when "speaking *ex cathedra*," or otherwise? Or did he ever personally speak *ex cathedra* at all?

2d. Did he ever pardon sins, not as against himself or the Church, but as against God, so that they could not be charged against the sinner in a future state?

If neither of these can be proved of him, then his so-called successors, and their priests, in claiming such attributes, as being inherited or in any way derived from or through him, must be impostors; without raising the question whether Peter or any of the Apostles transmitted such power to any who have since claimed it, assuming that it was possessed by the Apostles at first; or asking why Romanists do not also claim the power of healing the sick, raising the dead, or working the other miracles of the Apostles.

3d. When the Romans seceded from the Church, under the circumstances mentioned, did they not thereby become heretics and schismatics? If they did, they are, according to their own theories, no better than heathens, outside of the pale of salvation.

4th. Did St. Peter exercise any dominion over the rest of the Apostles, and was he ever at Rome, and if so, was he the bishop of it?

5th. Assuming that he was at Rome, and the bishop of it, can the Pope prove he is his *legitimate* successor? That is, can he show that every link connecting him with "Blessed Peter" was genuine, according to the rule of consecration that requires that every one contributing to the consecration during the past, and spreading out in every direction, up to the time of the Apostles, had no flaw or base alloy in it? Or if that rule would be too arbitrary and comprehensive, what other one would he adopt; or what does he mean by consecration, as conveying anything from the Apostles?

6th. How does he regard the consecrations made in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when two and sometimes three sets of pontiffs, cardinals and councils claimed, at the same time, to be the Church, each consecrating bishops and priests, and anathematizing the others and all consecrated by them? And in what light does he regard the acts of the Church at Rome, and the consecrations made by it, when seized upon, as it often was, by as abandoned men as ever lived?

When a religion becomes established and dominated by a priesthood, and especially when not surrounded or mixed up with a conflicting one, people, as a body, born and brought up under its influence, so far as they have religion at all, acquire and follow it as naturally as they do the ways and observances, the dialect and feelings of nationality, of the country in which they have been reared; and it becomes to them something like an instinct of nature. This applies to the Pope no less than the most ignorant peasant, in regard to what they profess, let its nature and merits, origin and development, or corruption, be what they may. Nor, for that matter, could the Pope even have acquired the art of feeding himself as he does had he not been taught it, or learned it by imitating people around him; to such an extent are we generally indebted to our fellow-creatures, or society, for the knowledge we possess, whatever that knowledge may be. It is questionable if what Romanists hold in regard to religion generally takes a stronger hold on their belief, feelings or observances, than the religions of Pagans did on their votaries, who never professed to furnish real proofs or arguments to support the origin or truth of what they believed or taught. And the same may be said in regard to the heathen to-day. The absolute and all-controlling despotism of the Romanist system fills, as it were, the mind and almost the atmosphere which the person breathes, leaving little chance for him to think or act otherwise than the community has hitherto done; assuming that he has the capacity to do it, or has had it so trained that it could act in such a way, or had materials within its reach on which, like the process of digestion, it could operate; or had education of any kind, or had others near him to assist him, who are much more apt to thwart him in any desire he may entertain to change his belief. If he doubts or becomes indifferent to it, it is, as it were, in secret, however he may, from habit or fear, outwardly observe it; and so he becomes an infidel, unable to advance in his doubts, with no glimmering in any tangible shape of what is better than what he was brought up to (and that is very common among Romanists), so that, at the very best, he sends for a priest at his latter end; for he has inherited with his blood too great a dislike for the "Black Protestants" to apply to them for relief. Sometimes he lives and dies an atheist, or a deist at the best.

Strong as the feeling of submission is that is shown by a sincere lay Romanist, whose religion constitutes in no way his living, calling, or position in society, it is infinitely more so in the case of the priest, who is absolutely bound to his position in every way in which he can be held. All priests are so brought up, that it might be said of their education that every part of it is directed to the creation of a strong religious feeling, in order that they might "breathe religion," such as it is. According to their system, there is little merit in following their calling, for the despotic discipline of their Church, and the daily, almost hourly, calls upon them to discharge its many kinds of duties, urge them on, and keep them continually moving round in the vortex in which they were

reared, and in which they live, and move, and have their being. In short, they are priests, whose duty is not to think, but learn the system of their infallible Church, and do the work of priests, to which they have been sworn and educated, as so many well-made and well-oiled machines, who have received all their instruction without question, or almost the capacity of questioning it. As human nature, in all its aspects, with trifling or occasional variations, perpetuates itself from generation to generation, so do religion and the priesthood which dominates it; each contributing to the creation and maintenance of the other, the priests acting on the people, and the people acting on the priests—a continual action and reaction that keep both alive, and lead to the filling up of the ranks of the priesthood, and the perpetuation of the common religion. So much are priests so many machines, so to speak, that, with the Bible in their hands, Protestantism seems to the best of them a mystery, however much one may strive to get them to understand that it is nothing but the teaching of Christ and his Apostles, whom they (and the Jesuits in particular), in their own peculiar way, profess to have so much at heart to glorify before men.

If a doubt arises in the mind of a priest, under almost any ordinary circumstances, it is generally kept to himself, on account of every priest being the other's confessor and detective. If he becomes an infidel or atheist, "having his conscience seared with a hot iron," it makes no difference to him what he thinks of the position he fills. Like many a Pagan priest of old, he is "in the service of the gods, if there be gods," but he does not believe in what is taught; he does not see, however, that it does any harm; it might be true, or not true, so far as he knows or cares; at least, he does not doubt the phenomena of human nature, and all its wants and superstitions, with which he is continually called upon and forced to deal: he will do his sworn duty, which is eagerly sought and accepted by his people, whatever the result may be. And as regards himself, he will submit to all the offices of the Church, even the last, not because he believes in them, or because they can benefit or cannot hurt him, but because it is his sworn duty to do so, as a "true son of the Church;" while he will defend it to the last against all opposers.

The position occupied by priests seems to them something like an inherent part of human nature itself, for it has existed, in some form, in all ages and religions (the Christian only excepted), as if people were created for them, and they for the people, in whose minds there is a vacuum in regard to ghostly matters, which they, without controversy, question or doubt, have to fill, whether it relates to this life principally, as under the old Pagan system, or this life and the life to come, both of which Romanism embraces; the future life being the principal fulcrum used by them to operate on the passions to secure obedience to their Order, which identifies itself in the highest degree with the most important matter that concerns man. It is for them, the sole and exclusive possessors of truth and power, to direct, manage and dominate over others in things spiritual, and temporal so far as they can accomplish it; and live upon them, as one animal looks upon another as its natural prey; and their constant thought is about them. Being an exclusive caste, by virtue of its consecration, and having many peculiarities which are kept secret from the world, it is exceedingly jealous of outsiders prying into its actions, or the principles by which it is governed and held together; and that these should be divulged by any of themselves, or that anything

derogatory to a member should be made public. It necessarily occupies a position like that of a conspiracy against the rest of the world, as if it slept over a volcano that might burst out at any time (however much it may feel assured of the absolute submission of its devotees), particularly when there are "heretics" in the community. That can be plainly seen in the furtive glances of the priests, especially when they cannot immediately tell the persuasion of the people they meet with, although their deportment towards them soon reveals what it is. The priests know well the estimation in which the "heretic" holds them, and few of them can be unaware that their calling has been stamped upon their countenances, let them disguise themselves in almost any way they please; countenances which are generally anything but pleasant for the rest of the world to contemplate.

The principal idea in the minds of priests is that of "shepherds and sheep;" and they "handle their flocks" as if they were literally sheep, confessing and pardoning them, and collecting their dues, with the expertness that comes from practice, as real sheep are shorn or dressed. Well has the confessional been called a "slaughter-house of consciences," for both confessor and confessed. It presents a wonderfully mutual and ghastly fascination for priest and people—a spell, laid upon both in early youth, and practised ever since, that can hardly be broken—the one, of all ages and sexes and conditions in life, pouring into the mind of the other sins of every nature, whether in thought, word or deed, and often all the circumstances connected with them; making the priest's mind the receptacle of the moral filth of the world, dug out by the most systematic cross-questioning, and drawn up, as it were, with a stomach-pump, and suggesting sins that might never otherwise occur to the devotee. The most deplorable part of the confessional is when women must divulge the most secret peculiarities of their nature to the priests, to the younger of whom it is often agreeable enough; but many of them will lament the result, and shed tears when they, in their turn, confess, and yet will almost immediately afterwards enter the pulpit, and in the most devout and eloquent language expatiate on the "miraculous interposition of God in keeping his priests as pure as angels in the confessional." They come well trained to fill the office, having had to take their degree of competency from some hoary old professor of the science. Then in God's name they pardon the penitents, placing them in the position of never having sinned; and that over and over again, even hundreds of times, for the same person, sinning, confessing and being pardoned in rotation, each time drawing their fees when they do it.* In short, the priest is their "keeper" in this world, and opens unto them the gate of happiness in the next, at his pleasure, or according to his judgment, taking toll from them when in life, and from their relations after death. There are so many singular things peculiar to the priests of Rome, that, in spite of the honours and submission shown them by their followers, one would think they must have a sense of inward degradation when possessed of some of the finer feelings of our nature, and to a great extent, if not altogether, sincere in most of what they teach and practise of their worship, which is "in all things too religious," as St. Paul characterized that of the Athenians. And language can-

* It will naturally occur to the reader to ask, is this the system that some people are anxious to see introduced as part of the religion of the Church of England? Let it be once established, and it would soon swallow all the rest.

not express the detestation in which they should be held, should they totally disbelieve what they profess —"speaking lies in hypocrisy"— especially when they undertake to pardon sins against the Creator.

The power or influence possessed by the priests of Rome resembles, firstly and generally, that exercised by those of old Paganism, as well as any other human religion that exists, or has ever existed. It has been infinitely increased by the terrors of death and the invisible world, in an especial degree peculiar to Christianity, the keys of which the priests say they hold. This claim the devotees so absolutely believe in, that their constant thoughts are to have a priest before the breath leaves their bodies, to insure them ultimately, as they think, a place in heaven, however severe or long the pains of purgatory; and that masses shall be paid for to release their souls from the intermediate state, and pass them to their final resting place. The ancient religions laid claim to no such power; they had not even any definite ideas regarding a future state, although it was believed in, in a general way, with many crude superstitions connected with it. Nor did their priests trouble themselves much, if anything, with the consciences of men; all that they demanded was that the temples should be attended, and the gods worshipped, according to established ritual, which contained no doctrinal system involving happiness or misery in a future state, based on historical or revealed truths, but sacrifices, prayers and spectacles, and ceremonies that extended to the minutest detail of public, social, and private life; and gave such freedom, or variety, to humanity that it could invoke a deity for every place or object, want or occasion, faculty, feeling, or passion, virtue, or even vice, to which it was subject. Such a religion rested on ritual observance and the authority of the priests, and ancient tradition, that is, on legend and immemorial usage. On that it was that Cicero made his characters say, "I must believe the religion of our ancestors without any proof," and, "It is the part of a wise man to uphold the religious institutions of our ancestors, by the maintenance of their rites and ceremonies;" to publicly deny which endangered the person at the hands of the people, no less than the priests, whose only care was that the gods should be worshipped, according to law, with all that that implied. Paganism would tolerate any kind of thought or conduct that submitted to its authority, and attended the temples, but persecuted everything that impugned it; and would not molest other religions, or forms of worship, becoming established by law, that admitted their worship, however much they might differ; such being the religious genius of the ancient world, expressed by the phrase, "intercommunity of gods."* And so pleasantly did that religion generally present itself to the people, that Plutarch, who was priest at Chæronea, remarked:—"What we esteem the most agreeable things in human life are our holidays, temple-feasts, initiatings, processionings, with our public prayers and solemn devotions."

On what other basis does Romanism practically rest than the old Pagan one, even including to a great extent the intercommunity of

* "For individuals to worship private gods, or new gods, or strange gods, would introduce a confusion of religions, and all kinds of unknown ceremonies. This is not the way in which gods accepted by the priests and by the Senate should be worshipped, even if they approved of such regulations" (Cicero on the Laws, by Younge, p. 439). "The rights of ancestors are likewise to be preserved in their families, for since the ancients approached nearest to the gods, that religion which the gods handed down to them is a tradition most worthy of memorial" (p. 440).

creeds? It is not particular, when it has not the power to enforce obedience, as to the variations of rituals, or even doctrines, provided submission is made to the Pope—the essential point in the system—even undisguised heathenism being to a great extent tolerated under such circumstances. Convince Romanists, beyond all question, of most of their doctrines and practices having no foundation in Scripture, tradition, or authentic history, but absolutely contrary thereto; that would not alter their belief in them. A large part of them seem impervious to the least suspicion of error in them, having been brought up to believe that it is a deadly sin to call in question or doubt them, or even put themselves in the way of hearing either done; and not that they lack the capacity to entertain or understand what is said in regard to them. They will answer that they "believe what the Church believes, because she is infallible," without being able to give an intelligible definition to the words used, and ignoring what may be said of the claim of infallibility. This is only the old Pagan reason expressed by Cicero:—"I must believe the religion of our ancestors without any proof;" and which Romanists would hold if their Church laid no claim to infallibility, and could not even tell how it originated, or how it came into possession of the doctrines or observances which it teaches. But the idea of infallibility gives a peculiar form to the natural sentiment, and a peculiar strength to it; not because it was ever demonstrated to Romanists in the dark ages, when the people were not in a position to judge of proof, or to Romanists to-day, whether ignorant or otherwise, but because it has been persistently and on all occasions asserted by those in possession of the religion, and submitted to as a natural and inherent part of it, without question. And no matter how much it has departed from the word of God, or from tradition or history, or how much it has in positive opposition to them, or how much it has varied ever since, or how much it has added up till to-day, including the immaculate conception and the ever-virginity of Mary, and the infallibility of the Pope, Romanists assert that, "Everything the Church believes she has received direct from the Apostles, having the unanimous consent of the fathers to support it; and that she has never varied in any of her teaching!"

Christianity originated when civilization was at its height, and differed from Paganism in that it was based on historical facts. Its real doctrines and precepts have come down to us in the form of history, although now nearly overlaid by the traditions, superstitions and impostures of Rome. Romanists are indeed in possession of the Western division of the Church, in an historical sense, while the Eastern division, differing from the other in many points of government and discipline, doctrine and ritual, denies the validity of its baptism, and treats it with scorn generally. Paganism having nothing positive to appeal to as to its origin, found in that circumstance an element of strength, for it could neither be attacked nor defended on that ground, but rested upon the natural feeling of man in all ages, that of "venerating the religion of its ancestors."*

* This is the ground on which Protestantism itself really rests—the religion of its ancestors; these ancestors being Christ and his Apostles. Without a revelation, human nature can fall back on nothing but what Cicero says, as we have seen:—"Since the ancients approached nearest to the gods, that religion which the gods handed down to them is a tradition most worthy of memorial."

Romanists lay great stress on their belief being "that of their ancestors," without asking themselves how far back these ancestors run. Such a doctrine would have prevented these ancestors

It made a strong and a long fight against Christianity, and to a great extent ultimately smothered it. Like a woman marrying, it lost its name and personal identity, but transmitted to posterity a numerous and vigorous progeny. It gave to the Romanists the form of their churches, and many of their temples, altars and idols; their government and organization; their pontiff, priests and vestals; and a multitude of their peculiarities, such as canonizations or demigodism, saints' days and festivals, incense, lustrations and holy water, votive offerings, pontifical dispensations, consecration of sacred places, winking, nodding, sweating and bleeding images, relics, vestments, etc.; all of which have been palmed off upon the world as Christianity! It invented its confessional 1,250 years after the introduction of Christianity, for, as Dean Stanley, in his *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, says:—"The priestly expression of absolution, which in the Western Church was in the same thirteenth century changed into the positive form 'I absolve thee,' in the Eastern Church is still, as it always was, 'May the Lord absolve thee.'" *

Let any disinterested and candid person carefully, or even superficially, study the New Testament and Romanism, not altogether as it exists, in some churches, in the midst of Protestants, but as it is found in the books, hearts and practices of its priests and people all over the world, and he cannot but conclude that *that* religion is *not* Christianity. It will naturally enough call itself by that name, for such, at least, it has inherited; and it will as naturally fall back on its historical records and associations, in the manner of all institutions known among men, however unworthy it is of them, and however much it may have departed from its letter and spirit, and substituted others for them, to give support to its existence, and the tremendous powers it lays claim to. No religion was ever introduced that gave a priesthood more plausible pretexts to exercise dominion over its followers, or more powerful machinery to oppress them, illustrating the saying that what is the best becomes the worst when prostituted to the basest of purposes. It has been said that Romanism could not have spread so far, or lasted so long, had it not some deep foundation in

embracing Christianity, in whatever form it was presented to them; and as an argument, would have applied to any superstition or idolatry that ever existed in the world. Two systems of Paganism in competition would resemble two persons contesting the possession of property without title-deeds. Of course, each could claim and maintain what it was in possession of, for the reason that possession gives a title when no one can show a better. And so it would happen that the one system of Paganism could not injure the other, so far as the *origin* of each was concerned. Romanism, however, is in possession on two titles, that of occupancy, as the successor of both Paganism and Christianity, and a formidably specious one in the shape of Christian muniments, that make it a difficult matter to reduce by any ordinary form of procedure. The better way, as I have said at page 55, is for the world, as representing the Crown, to call on Romanists to "prove their pedigree," and produce the charter by which they hold, to see whether they have performed its conditions, or have corresponded otherwise with the description of the parties therein described. In a mere historical sense, as representing possession—if that amounts to anything, as distinguished from the spirit, doctrines, and practices of the Christian religion—the Easterns can always be played off against the Romans, putting the latter on the defensive, to prove that they are what they claim to be.

* *New York Edition of* 1862, *p.* 126.—In this work we find the following remarks:—"No theory of the Christian Church can be complete which does not take some account of their [the Eastern Churches'] existence," in which are "to be found nearly a third part of Christendom—one hundred millions of souls professing the Christian faith" (p. 89).—"The field of Eastern Christendom is a comparatively untrodden field" (p. 88).—"The centralization of the West, as displayed in the Papacy, is unknown in the East" (p. 128).

human nature. The same question could be started with regard to the corrupt Eastern Churches, and the origin, development and continuance of all the human religions that have existed, and especially the Paganism which Christianity encountered in Asia, Africa and Europe. And yet we find that these maintained themselves for centuries after Christianity made its appearance. If such could exist for so many ages when undisturbed, and for so long after being attacked by Christianity, what difficulty can there be in believing that Romanism—a mixture of degraded Christianity and almost everything that could be added to it—can maintain and extend itself, when it rests upon an infinitely better foundation than the old Paganism, and is so much better buttressed than any human religion known? The existence, perpetuation, and increase of Romanism among the same races that followed the old Paganism, and that possessed the nature, wants and necessities of men of to-day, need therefore cause no comment, surprise or wonder. And thus it happens that Christianity (in other instances besides Romanism), after being so thoroughly degraded as to become a religion of nature, or "of this world," will perpetuate itself, with some Christian doctrines and observances, while two threads of it hang together, where it has thoroughly obtained a footing, and is dominated by a priesthood, and is allowed to exist in peace, owing to the personal, social and political necessity of man having a religion of some kind, and the difficulty attending the introduction of a new one, of divine origin or purely human in its nature.

We must not forget that Romanism has been the gradual growth of ages, each generation, as it were, having contributed, and is still contributing, to its development; each generation accepting its predecessor's additions, as history records, and daily experience testifies. Having become fairly established, there would be little chance, in the face of its organization and the common belief in its claims, of any one calling it in question, unless in secret, without the objection being instantly suppressed. It is too serious a matter to interfere, in any age, with any of the established beliefs of society that have no reference to religion, for any one to have thought of attacking a creed like that of Rome, based on the infallibility of the Church, at the head of which was "our sovereign lord the Pope," who was lord paramount of this world, to whom kings were subject, who possessed the keys of heaven and hell, and could bless or curse men or nations at pleasure, giving dispensations and indulgences for sins still to be committed, and making that sin which was no sin, and that not sin which was sin. The Church was the heir of old Rome, as regards its government, language and literature, its laws, sciences, and arts. Its priests were the sole depositories of education and knowledge, civilization and government, the owners of vast wealth wrung from the community, and the dispensers of charity, in an ignorant society, dominated by the barbarian chiefs that overran the Western Empire. They were also the instruments of the amalgamation of races and the abolition of serfship, to whom the people looked for their religion and assistance in the direction of their temporal matters, and of whom they were proud, although treated in the matter of religion (conducted in a language unknown to them) as cattle are foddered. And it is a question whether what they did were merits, or merely, or for the most part, to maintain their dominion over their followers.

This is the power with which Protestants are called upon to dispute for the religious empire of the

world. They meet an opponent in possession of a faith "from time immemorial, and universal in its domain," with a people, or a large part of it, devotedly attached to it; which all history and the very nature of man prove to be the most difficult of labours to change *by aggression from without*, even when it lays claim to no positive authority for its origin and truth. They must also meet an organization which has been truly called "the very masterpiece of human wisdom," the principal end of which is to maintain its dominion over its subjects; and which utilizes every class and kind of sentiment to be found within its communion, forming them into societies for that purpose; all—lay as well as clerical—being inspired by the same motive, and acting as one body to accomplish the common end; the most ignorant of its members being the most devoted to its interests. If Christianity itself, with its divine influences and miraculous accompaniments, did not succeed till after many centuries in ridding part of the world of heathenism, which, in a sense, rested on nothing, and, as it were, had nothing to support it, how can Protestantism expect, by ordinary means, to succeed with what is, for the most part, Christian in name only, in possession of the history and associations of Christianity, running back so long, with its many plausible arguments to support it, as being the only Christianity, and all others claiming it to be but "doctrines of hell;" both of which its votaries generally absolutely believe in, notwithstanding it being proved, or offered to be proved, from the Scriptures, tradition and history, that Protestantism—a protest against the errors of Rome—is the Christianity of Christ and his Apostles, and that Romanism itself is a "doctrine of hell"?

Romanists, with the exception of many of the men, who are such little more than in name, find what is necessary to serve the purposes of *a* religion in their belief, and ignorance of everything different from it, and a determination to learn nothing else; for their belief is most sincere, and they cannot bring their minds to entertain the question whether their priests, "who never deceived them," can be in error, and far less impostors. The sincere Romanist, realizing the certainties of life and death, and the idea of a future state, with its rewards and punishments, believes and does what the priest tells him to do. What he wants is a certainty, which the priest readily enough assures him of; and he accepts the pardon of his sins in this world, which the priest as readily gives him, for to wait till forgiven by God, in this world or the next, is not what his knowledge or fears call for. The confession of sins at death, with a desire to atone for them and lead a better life, made to some one present on that awful occasion, are feelings natural to man, which Romanists have cunningly abused, as they have perverted most of the other religious instincts. Not content with death-bed scenes, they will confess and pardon votaries proceeding on short trips, such as to bathe in the sea, with the same object, giving them amulets to carry on their persons as sovereign assurances of certainty and safety. Nor will a surgeon approach Romanists, in serious cases, till after they have seen their priest, or rather the priest them, when they become the most satisfactory subjects to operate on.

Nominal Romanists, whatever they may ultimately become, will, as members of their respective communities or nationalities, defend their Church, as they would any other institution that is theirs, not merely because it is "the religion of their fathers," but from motives of pure party-spirit, as is common with

human nature. But the sincere Romanists stake everything upon their submission to their Church; so that, to disturb them in their belief is like rending their heart-strings, to say nothing of the incapacity of many, if not most, of them to acquire a new religion. Even Samuel Johnson used to say that many an Englishman would become a religious man, if he only knew how to go about it. Sincere Romanists, however, are seldom such by reflection and knowledge, like Protestants; but by having been the subjects of the ghostly influences of the priest and Church before their earliest recollections, and which they have hardly ever been without.

As regards the priests, many of them are doubtless sincere, particularly the less intellectual or more ignorant ones, however questionable they may privately consider some of the doctrines and practices of their Church, or how they originated, or some of their own actions in life, or the means they resort to to support the interest and dignity of the Church, and everything connected with it. The whole matter concerns the questions, what we are, where we come from, and whither we go, about which no one personally knows anything, but must naturally look somewhere outside of himself for information. Everything Romanists have, they have inherited, and been most rigorously brought up to. It is a possession received from a high antiquity, to be believed in, maintained, and transmitted unimpaired to the end of time. It must be upheld against every opponent, as everything that is pure and holy, angelic and august, surrounded with its halo of hoary antiquity, and the grandeur of mighty Rome; and everything derogatory to it must be refuted, denied, or got rid of in some way. All this having been bandied about and dinned into the ears of priests from generation to generation—every one receiving what was asserted, or none disputing it, and all outside more or less believing and practising it—must necessarily have become the belief to a greater or less extent among the priests; at least that, as a matter of fact, whether always completely believed in or not, it was the religion that all should obey and venerate. Many of them, however, from the Pope downwards, have been actual, if not professed, infidels and atheists, looking upon everything they taught and defended, as *to them*, so many fortunate and profitable fables. It is a great stretch on the charity and credence of those outside of their fold to believe that many of them can be *altogether* sincere in what they profess and teach.* Romanists, before they began the

* Many things will occur to the reader under this head. For example, a convert leaves a large amount by will for masses for his soul, and a high dignitary calls upon the widow for a further large sum, giving as his reason that the legacy had got him only so far out of purgatory. This happened to my own knowledge in a Protestant community, but I pass over the particulars for an obvious reason. Priests can go a great length in a matter like this, or in anything tyrannical, or even odious; for the devotees will turn to their Church, however hardly used, as they cannot change their religion as they do their garments. And no one knows that like the priests.

In communities entirely Romanist, the poorest and most ignorant devotees are frequently treated, in many respects, little better than dogs; indeed, as many, on getting possession of dogs, treat them roughly to test their dog-like quality of submission, so do priests sometimes appear to test, in a somewhat similar way, the obedience of their people. The genius of their religion makes it a moral necessity to exact absolute submission to them as representing it. When a contractor engages labourers on an extensive scale, and especially when at a distance from powerful local authority, he will sometimes "keep a priest;" and frequently will "his reverence" be seen coming "tearing" down the road, with a whip in hand. And that man would be "torn from limb to limb" who would dare to lay his hand upon him, or treat him disrespectfully.

study for the priesthood, are assumed to have been as highly endowed with the natural religious instinct as other people; and their *second* careful training has developed in them a strong religious, priestly, or sacerdotal feeling, connected with what is distinct from the material things of life, such as may be called forth by parts of the service, its dogmas, incense, music, singing, praying and confession, and ceremonies foolish enough in themselves, and that general obeisance to what is outside of themselves, and which may be called ghostly; without destroying, but rather sharpening, those instincts that are applied to advance the interests of their corporation—all so impressed on them that it is difficult to wean them from "Mother Church." To realize in some degree the ghostly feeling of Romanists—lay or clerical—let any one enter their churches, and lay aside his religious knowledge and principles, and he can feel what Pagans were inspired with when they entered their temples and gloomy religious groves, provided he has a lively imagination, and a sensitive feeling of the religion of nature. And that can be said in a much greater degree of Romanists themselves, to whom the scene conveys, generally, an exquisite pleasure and a profound awe; and especially when they contemplate in the mass, God on the altar, their own belief, confession, and absolution, and the mysterious priest as the instrument of the miracle of transubstantiation, and the custodier of the keys of heaven for all believers. Such phenomena as these are nearly everything, when supported by the common example of old and young; no one questioning what is taught and professed, and no information to be had to the contrary, or no disposition shown to examine it. Such people, when they come together, or think of their religion, will look at each other for encouragement and support, passive or active, on a question like this, that has come down to them from a high antiquity, when anyone expresses a doubt in regard to it; and the most positive, noisy and daring of them will carry the crowd with them in the cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," "whom all Asia and the world worshippeth." And "what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter?" "Things that cannot be spoken against" (Acts xix.), as if they were facts that no one could or would dare doubt. Humanity as such will not question, and is hardly capable of questioning a national worship of this kind, but receives it actively or passively, with something like a natural instinct. Whatever the abuses, real or apparent, that may have crept into it, it was not for the priests publicly to make an ado about them, for fear of destroying the whole religion of the Great Diana herself. If it is hard for people to understand why the more intelligent of the priests of Rome do not condemn many things connected with their religion, but rather teach and practise them, it can be answered that such is for the interest of themselves and their infallible Church, which has to be upheld under all circumstances; to say nothing of the things complained of being submitted to, and doubtless believed in by as intelligent lay members, who have no particular interest in doing so. Considering the amazing things that have been practised as religion, we need feel no surprise at what comes up of that nature, and must therefore reserve an opinion on what is believed or not believed among Romanists, lay or clerical. At the worst, we can yield to the priests of Rome the credit due to as much belief in their system as could be given to the priests of Paganism, past and present, whatever that might be, provided

they have never read the original charter of Christianity, and been made aware of the changes and variations of those claiming to represent it. They have every *human* motive to make the most of a religion which none of them, on their own knowledge, and relying upon themselves, can tell whether it is true or false; and they might say of it what Cicero made the pontiff of old Rome say of the gods, that he did not believe in them as a man, but did as a pontiff, and as one upholding the religion of his ancestors. The real moral responsibility of the priests of Rome would begin with the study of the word of God, and tradition, and history, contrasting these with the doctrines and practices of Rome to-day; which they will not do, like one that is afraid or ashamed to look at himself in a mirror.

As the old Pagans, surrounded by all the pomp and awe of animal sacrifices, incensed, prayed and sang praises to "Pan and all the gods," which existed only in their imaginations, so does human nature worship its deities in various countries to-day. As the Romans adored Jupiter, and the Greeks Zeus—"the father of gods and men"—with a host of demigods, and to a great extent believed in God in the abstract, but did not worship Him adequately, or only along with a multitude of beings of their own creation, so it can be said of Romanists in their worship of God and the saints, who are too numerous to be mentioned individually. They can as easily believe in Christ and the Holy Ghost as they believe in God and the saints, or as the old Pagans believed in Jupiter, or as Eastern nations believe in their deities, when they have been taught from infancy to do so, and when it is obligatory on them as a part of an inherited public worship, which they could not altogether corrupt or modify. Among Romanists, Christ and the Holy Ghost may be considered, in common with God and the saints, as representing the deities of ancient Rome, in the possession of a sodality of priests, or close sacerdotal corporation, making their worship a Pagan one in reality, although Christian in name. Here we would have the major deities changed and presented merely as a blind to the real Paganism and idolatry that make up the worship, viz.: that of the Virgin and the saints, and the innumerable superstitions connected with them; Christ being seldom mentioned or thought of, but brought forward on public occasions to support or constitute their position before the world; and God merely a kind of Jupiter whom no one must trouble, but through the saints deputed from one to another, till the petition reaches the "greatest and best," "the father of gods and men," of the heathen. Christ and the Holy Ghost seem, in practical Romanism, to be there merely because they were inherited, and could not in the nature of things be kept out; while the Bible is a superfluity, and a source of great weakness when appealed to. If one had entered many an old Roman temple, he would have found the people, with more or less sincerity, according to the occasion, worshipping Jupiter and some of the demigods, and many with great sincerity at all times. Let one enter a Roman Church to-day, and he will find substantially the same religion, the same human nature, and the same degrees of sincerity; the saints being, at the very least, demigods that are supposed to hear and answer the prayers of millions at the same moment, that is, beings existing in that respect, and often in every respect, only in the imaginations of the worshippers.

It is strange that Christianity, which recognized the worship, in all its simplicity, of God, Christ, and the Holy Ghost, only, and our duties to each other, should, as it

were, have ended in the system which we have been considering. And it is strange that the humility of Christ, "whose kingdom was not of this world," to the extent that he would not even give an opinion regarding the division of an inheritance between brothers, should have one like the Pope claiming to be his vicegerent, or "God on earth"—the supreme ruler in things temporal as well as spiritual — who has shed oceans of blood, and tortured the bodies and souls of men, for no other offence than reading God's Word, and entertaining conscientious opinions in consequence thereof. Such a phenomenon, with all its idolatry, can only be accounted for for some such reason as that already given, viz: "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 11, 12).*

The Pope has been declared to be infallible to enunciate, but what would that avail if his followers are not equally infallible to understand? Does this Italian "God on earth" reveal his will from day to day in Latin, when *he* might not infallibly understand that language? Who in that case would guarantee the infallibility of his scribe, or the infallible correctness of the translations into the languages of all the tribes of the earth, or their infallible meaning to the bog-trotters and brigands, or the most ignorant of beings, clothed in rags and covered with vermin—mere Mumbo Jumbo religionists — who are the most devoted of Romanists? In short, we would require to be all infallible to make the infallibility of one of any use to the world; and then the infallible proclamation of that one would be in a measure superfluous. As it is, the Pope, manifesting his divinity in the hearing of one who did not understand his language, would illustrate the saying of St. Paul, when he wrote:—"If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me" (1 Cor. xiv. 11). And who is to decide when the Pope speaks *ex cathedrâ*, and when he does *not* speak *ex cathedrâ*, or how can that question be settled? For all practical purposes, every priest, according to the system, is infallible in the teaching he gives his followers, or how can they feel sure that what he tells them is truth? And what would that avail them, if they were not also infallible to receive and understand what he tells them? Under any circumstances, even with Romanists, there must be the right of private judgment, whatever it might result in.

Rather than "search the Scriptures," which *he* dares not say are not infallible, the Pope would have nothing less than the human family receive, as divine and infallible truths, *his* dogmas, conveyed through a variety of earthen conduits, some of them being of the basest materials; while he, or the synagogue of which he is the chief, infallibly assures us that mankind at large can make nothing of these Scriptures, and would be guilty of the highest presumption, if not absolute profanity, in even attempting to do it, unless in rare instances, or by priestly permission. Of these same Scriptures St. Paul wrote to Timothy:—"From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. iii. 15). The apparent trouble of the Pope in regard to the Scriptures is to get rid of their circulation, and perhaps themselves, altogether, if he could do either with any show of decency; and, not being able to do it, beyond

* See page 53.

mistranslating them in many places, and striking out the second commandment, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," it is easy to understand why he proscribes them to the extent he does, or limits the reading of them; for when they are earnestly and prayerfully studied by his followers, they lead them to "renounce him and his works," with a bitterness that almost amounts to an execration, after loosening themselves from the toils in which they had been held. Could not the Pope, in virtue of his recently proclaimed superhuman attribute, be prevailed on to favour the world with an *ex cathedrâ* decision on the meaning of the following passages of Scripture:—

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."—1 Tim. iv. 1–3.

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."—2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

Lord Bacon used to say that if these passages were printed as a "hue and cry," no constable in England would find a difficulty in laying his hands on the person wanted.

The ten commandments were delivered to Moses amidst

"Thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. . . . . And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly."—Ex. xix. 16–18.

And Christ, whose vicegerent the Pope claims to be, said:—

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew v. 18, 19). "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."—Mark xiii. 31, and Luke xxi. 33.

Here is the second commandment, which Romanists keep out of their catechisms and books of devotion, and the Scriptures themselves, dividing the tenth, so as to nominally preserve the original number:—

"Thou shalt not make unto thee *any graven image*, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not *bow down thyself to them, nor serve them:* for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."—Ex. xx. 4–6.

And in the last verse but two of the Scriptures we find the following:—

"And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."—Rev. xx. 19.

JOHN STUART MILL: A STUDY.*

I.

HIS RELIGION.

THE most satisfactory way of treating his Autobiography is to string together selections from it, and with comments on these make them furnish an antidote to its mischievous tendencies, in the way that a witness is made to prove the worthlessness of the cause in favour of which he is brought forward to testify. The book begins badly:—

"My father, the son of a petty tradesman and (I believe) small farmer, at Northwater Bridge, in the County of Angus, was, when a boy, recommended by his abilities to the notice of Sir John Stuart, of Fettercairn, one of the Barons of the Exchequer in Scotland, and was, in consequence, sent to the University of Edinburgh, at the expense of a fund established by Lady Jane Stuart (the wife of Sir John Stuart) and some other ladies, for educating young men for the Scottish Church. He there went through the usual course of study, and was licensed as a preacher, but never followed the profession, having satisfied himself that he could not believe the doctrines of that or any other Church. For a few years he was a private tutor in various families in Scotland, among others that of the Marquis of Tweeddale, but ended by taking up his residence in London, and devoting himself to authorship. Nor had he any other means of support until 1819, when he obtained an appointment in the India House" (p. 3).

"I was brought up from the first without any religious belief, in the ordinary acceptation of the term. My father, educated in the creed of Scotch Presbyterianism, had by his own studies and reflections been early led to reject not only the belief in Revelation, but the foundations of what is commonly called Natural Religion" (p. 38).

There is so much in the Autobiography that is so illy arranged, and so loosely and illogically put together, that among other things, the positive truth cannot be drawn from it in regard to the stages of the elder Mill's religious ideas; and there is much that requires explanation about him consenting to be educated by others for the Church, and being licensed to preach at the age of twenty-five, and then becoming a practical atheist. He is described as

"One who never did anything negligently; never undertook any task, literary or other, on which he did not conscientiously bestow all the labour necessary for performing it adequately" (p. 4).

A man of his talents and energy, with a conscience to regulate them, could not surely have taken four years' study in literature and philosophy, and then four years in divinity, at the university, in addition to his school and home training, and his "own studies and reflections," to make up his mind on the subject of the first principles of religion (saying nothing of Christianity). However that may be, he was received into the ranks of the clergy, as a probationer, after a severe examination into his religious knowledge, learning, walk and conversation, and giving specimens of his sermons and prayers; and it does not appear from the Autobiography that he did not preach occasionally for other clergymen, either before or while he was a tutor in the families mentioned. No doubt he was engaged in the latter capacity on the faith—implied or expressed—of his being a clergyman of the Church, believing its doctrines; and he was most probably employed while tutor

* Born May 20th, 1806; died May 8th, 1873.

in teaching the children their religious lessons, and reading the family prayers, or conducting the household worship. Notwithstanding that, his son says that he was "*early* led to reject not only the belief in Revelation, but the foundations of what is commonly called Natural Religion," merely on account of the moral and physical evil that is in the world, and the punishment that awaits the finally impenitent. The early period here mentioned was doubtless long before he was twenty-five, when licensed to preach; a supposition borne out when he says:—

"I have heard him say that the turning-point of his mind on the subject was reading Butler's 'Analogy.' That work, of which he always continued to speak with respect, kept him, as he said, for some considerable time, a believer in the divine authority of Christianity" (p. 38).

The "some considerable time" here mentioned is a very indefinite phrase, that might mean some months, or weeks, as well as years. He was naturally supposed to have been a believer in Christianity, for the reason that it was the religion of the community in which he was reared, as would be the case with a child, or a grown-up person whose mind might be called a sheet of blank paper; not as a matter of inquiry or evidence, but merely something floating in the air, like any popular idea. There is, therefore, an absurdity involved in the remark that it was only by hanging Butler around his neck he was kept, "for some considerable time," a believer; when he became an atheist, but not a *dogmatic* one, whatever the difference might be. "These particulars are important" (p. 39). Real particulars would have been important had he given us them, in place of the "slovenliness of thought" that throws no light on the religious history of his father from the day he went to college, or before he went there, till he left for London. The circumstances and details between the first doubt and the final step, had he been able and willing to give them, would doubtless have been interesting. The questions are, when did he first read Butler, and when did he throw him off? He doubtless read him not later than the first year of his attendance at the divinity hall, or while at the moral philosophy class, or as is the custom to-day. There is nothing to show that James Mill ever believed in Christianity, when he came to examine into it, except that Butler—"the turning-point of his mind"—kept him in check for "some considerable time"; previous to which he must, of course, have been a sceptic, possibly, but not probably, before he even went to college. At the best, Butler only kept him from going over to deism, but did not prevent him becoming an atheist. His belief in Christianity, under the circumstances, must have been only of a very so-so nature. And that is confirmed by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, for January, when he says:—"It seems, from an inquiry which has been made in the University Library of Edinburgh, that the books he was most given to read there were of a sceptical character." *

At any stage of his instruction James Mill could have declined the patronage of the ladies that befriended him, without avowing his infidelity or atheism, and betaken himself to many a calling in which opinions on religion were not required, or expected to be expressed or entertained, and earned his bread like an honest man. But he seems to have preferred acting the hypocrite for the benefit of the education and worldly advancement, illustrating, in some respects, a case given by him to his son,

* This was doubtless when he was studying literature and philosophy, during the first four years he was at College and before he entered the Divinity Hall.

"In which frankness on these subjects would either risk the loss of means of subsistence, or would amount to exclusion from some sphere of usefulness peculiarly suitable to the capacities of the individual" (p. 45).

It was after finally breaking with the Church, perhaps in consequence of disappointment of a benefice, and of the restraint on his godless opinions, that he gave vent to all his spitefulness against religion of every kind, natural as well as revealed; although all his intellectual training was received, as a gift, under its auspices, with the view of making him a servant at its altar; and but for which training he might have passed through life an atheistical master-baker, a heartless West India slave-driver, or something of that kind. It sounds odd to hear it said that *he* was once "among the prophets." Like a certain personage, he "went out from them because he was not of them." It would have been interesting had his son published, among his writings, the *written* trial discourses which he preached before the Presbytery when it licensed him, and solemnly set him apart, to defend that Christianity which he spent his life in attempting to destroy, and perhaps swore his son to do it after him. Here was verily a "wolf in sheep's clothing." As it was, the Church narrowly escaped receiving into its fold, not by climbing over the wall, but boldly entering it by the door, like a shepherd, one who was in reality "a thief and a robber."* And yet he is described by his son as

"Being not only a man whom nothing would have induced to write against his convictions [excepting in the case of India], but one who invariably threw into everything he wrote as much of his convictions *as he thought the circumstances would in any way permit*" (p. 4); and than whom "no one prized conscientiousness and rectitude of intention more highly, or was more incapable of valuing any person in whom he did not feel assurance of it" (p. 50).

Shortly after his arrival in London, he began to write his "History of India," a work which has been described as "an elaborate inculpation of the entire policy pursued by the East India Company. He believed that the ruling motives of the body, from almost the first hour of its existence, were commercial cupidity, and a desire of territorial aggrandizement" (*Athenæum*). "A constant attempt to underrate the services and conceal the great achievements of the East India Company" (*Blackwood*). Offensive as John Stuart Mill described this work to be, as calculated, in short, to raise up against him noth-

* The following remarks, made by Dr. Thomas Guthrie in his Autobiography, on the subject of ministers being appointed by patrons, are interesting as bearing on the case of James Mill:—

"This system, so far as students were concerned, had but one redeeming feature. Through it, boorish cubs were licked into shape, and vulgarly-bred lads acquired the manners of gentlemen; for most of those who had the ministry in view could obtain the favour of a patron in no other way than by becoming tutors in gentlemen's and noblemen's families. Few had the political influence which made it unnecessary for me to seek access to the Church in that way. The consequence was, that almost all divinity students were eager to get tutorships. In this capacity—entering the houses of landed gentlemen, associating there with people of cultivated habits, and becoming in a sense members of the family—they, however humble their origin, acquired those courteous and genteel manners which were more the characteristic of the ministers of my early days than they are of their successors" (p. 56).

Did Mill become, "for a few years," a "private tutor in various families in Scotland, among others that of the Marquis of Tweeddale," for the purpose of getting a church through their influence, as Dr. Guthrie says that "most of those who had the ministry in view" did? And then the question would arise, *when* did he "satisfy himself that he could not believe the doctrines of that or any other Church"? View the subject in any way we may, little regard can be had for his judgment or character under the circumstances.

ing but enemies in powerful quarters, and especially in the East India Company, "to whose commercial privileges he was unqualifiedly hostile, and on the acts of whose government he had made so many severe comments," but bearing testimony to (what could not be denied) its "good intentions towards its subjects," his father yet made a rush to the Company, on hearing that it wanted clerks, with an offer of his services, which were accepted. He became one of its most devoted servants, and, in his hard struggle for existence, had bread provided, and a nest feathered, for himself, and his son after him. The Company had evidently sense enough to receive the smart adventurer as a satellite, rather than allow him to become a thorn in its side, by attacking it through the press of the country. Both father and son were the strongest defenders, as well as the servants and advisers, of a corporation of merchants which exercised a rule the most absolute that perhaps ever existed, over a vast territory and population that had no voice in its government, in the face of the published writings of both on the rights of man, and of their individuality in the choice of legislators. Well might a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, for January, say:—

"Had Mill not been a servant of the East India Company it is impossible to doubt that he would have denounced it as one of the most odious of monopolies and close corporations, which held in subjection and bondage tens of millions of the human race."

And what *Blackwood's Magazine*, for the same month, says, is equally to the point:—

"Mill never, during his whole thirty-five years [service with the Company], opened his mouth against it, [but maintained to the last] that any change from such a system 'would necessarily be a change for the worse.'"

And Mill says of himself:—

"I was the chief manager of the resistance which the Company made to their own political extinction; and to the letters and petitions I wrote for them, and the concluding chapter of my treatise on Representative Government [everywhere but in India], I must refer for my opinions on the folly and mischief of this ill-considered change" (p. 249).

A man like James Mill was sure to impress on his son the same reticence in regard to religion that he exercised himself, and with the following result:—

"This point in my early education had, however, incidentally one bad consequence deserving notice. In giving me an opinion contrary to that of the world, my father thought it necessary to give it as one which could not prudently be avowed to the world. This lesson of keeping my thoughts to myself, at that early age, was attended with some moral disadvantages; though my limited intercourse with strangers, especially such as were likely to speak to me on religion, prevented me from being placed in the alternative of avowal or hypocrisy. I remember two occasions in my boyhood on which I felt myself in this alternative, and in both cases I avowed my disbelief and defended it. My opponents were boys, considerably older than myself: one of them I certainly staggered at the time, but the subject was never renewed between us: the other, who was surprised and somewhat shocked, did his best to convince me for some time, without effect" (p. 44).

He seems to have been proud of his atheism, as if it had been that of an aristocratic distinction, for thus he writes:—

"I am thus one of the very few examples in this country of one who has not thrown off religious belief, but never had it: I grew up in a negative state with regard to it. I looked upon the modern exactly as I did upon the ancient religion, as something which in no way concerned me. It did not seem to me more strange that English people should believe what I did not, than that the men I read of in Herodotus should have done so" (p 43).

He had already said, as we have

seen, that he "was brought up from the first without any religious belief, *in the ordinary acceptation of the term*" (p. 38), which qualification had evidently no meaning, as he afterwards said he *never had any* (p. 43). This is supported by what he says when he speaks of

"—A view of religion which I hold to be profoundly immoral—that it is our duty to bow down in worship before a Being whose moral attributes are affirmed to be unknowable by us, and to be perhaps extremely different from those which, when we are speaking of our fellow-creatures, we call by the same name" (p. 275).*

He was well drilled by his father, who seems to have made it a matter of *conscience* to do so, for he says:—

"It would have been wholly inconsistent with my father's ideas of duty to allow me to acquire impressions contrary to his convictions and feelings respecting religion" (p. 42).

Doubtless he treated with "scornful disapprobation" and "stern reprehension," and positively prohibited, any attempt of the poor mother, whom he kept in absolute subjection, to teach any of her large family to even lisp a prayer. There must be a reason for Mill not even mentioning her, or any of his brothers or sisters, beyond the trouble he had in teaching them; and it would be interesting to know how they turned out in regard to religion. His own history shows that it is possible to "breed and raise" practical atheists.† It may be that his father, looking on him as "the apple of his eye," the heir and successor of himself and creed, or rather want of a creed, let the rest of the family "run" in the matter of the important question of religion; about which Mill, with apparent want of candour, says nothing. And yet we might have expected him to have informed us on that point, since he dwelt on the subject at such length, returning again and again to it. The conclusion to be drawn from his father so jealously preventing him being taught anything on the subject of religion by others would be, that the rest of the family were brought up in the same way. The father "rejected all that is called religious belief" (p. 39). "He regarded it with the feeling due not to a mere mental delusion, but to a great moral evil. He looked upon it as the greatest enemy to morality," and as "radically vitiating the standard of morals" (p. 40); without saying what that standard of morals is, or where it is to be found, or how it can be made binding on men.

"He was supremely indifferent in opinion (though his indifference did not show itself in personal conduct) to all those doctrines of the common morality which he thought had no foundation but in asceticism and priestcraft" (p. 107). "And thus [says his son] morality continues a matter of blind tradition [!], with no consistent principle, nor even any consistent feeling, to guide it" (p. 42), [like Maurice's] "worthless heap of received opinions on the great subjects of thought" (p. 153).*

* This is strange language to come from a man who said that he "never had any religious belief." Of course, it would have been out of the question to have asked *him* to give us a "view of religion" that *was* "profoundly moral," or state where he found his ideas of morality on that or any other subject.

† There was something horrible in James Mill's course in this respect, if we judge him by his class, irrespective of its shades of unbelief; for such often, if not generally, teach the children nothing in regard to religion (and would sometimes wish that they rather were religious) but leave that question to the mother, or let the children pick up a creed of any kind, or in any way acquired. Often, when closely pressed, they will say that their soul is like the dove that could find no rest for the sole of its foot.

* The reader will feel it difficult, or rather impossible, to put a meaning on the language quoted.—Take the last six commandments in the Decalogue, for our negative morality, and the many injunctions, both negative and positive, scattered through the New Testament,

Well might the son say of the father's *religious* opinions, at least, that they "were more odious to all persons of influence, and to the common run of prosperous Englishmen, in that generation, than either before or since" (p. 4).

He seems to have profited by his father's instructions to the extent, at least, of keeping his religious opinions pretty much to himself, so that to the last people were in doubt on the subject; and on the occasion of standing for Westminster he says:—

"On one subject only—my religious opinions—I announced from the beginning that I would answer no questions" (p. 283).

Thus he seems to have gone through life muzzled on that question, except perhaps to very intimate friends, of his own way of thinking, and with the strictest confidence; but in writing the Autobiography he removed the muzzle, and expressed himself with all the pent-up hydrophobia of his nature, after so long a silence on a subject that lay nearest to his heart, as the work shows; leaving it as a legacy to the world at large, and perhaps particularly to the University of St. Andrews, "whose students had done me the honour of electing me to the office of Rector" (p. 306); and hounding on others in the same cause, for this is his posthumous wish on the subject:—

"On religion in particular, the time appears to me to have come when it is the duty of all who, being qualified in point of knowledge [which he doubtless never was], have on mature consideration satisfied themselves [which he apparently never did] that the current opinions are not only false but hurtful [how did he know that the religion itself was *false* or hurtful?], to make their dissent known" (p. 45). And he barbs his prayer with the remark: "At least if they are among those whose station or reputation gives their opinion a chance of being attended to."

He did not seem to be averse to any kind of allies, whoever or whatever they might be, that would enlist under a common banner in a crusade to banish both natural and revealed religion from the world; but he would prefer the influential kinds, of whom he probably speaks a little at random when he says:—

"The world would be astonished if it knew how great a proportion [what proportion he does not say] of its highest ornaments—of those most distinguished even in popular estimation for wisdom and virtue—are complete sceptics in religion [not atheists, like himself, it is hoped]; many of them refraining from avowal, less from personal considerations than from a *conscientious*, though now in my opinion a most mistaken, *apprehension, lest by speaking out what would tend to weaken existing belief, and by consequence* (as they suppose) *existing restraints, they should do harm instead of good*" (p. 45).

The people here mentioned are, by Mill's own admission, too sensible to make any other use of their religious opinions than keep them to themselves; and little chance is there of them ever ranging themselves under *his* standard in a war against what mankind hold, in some form or other, most sacred. No matter what all mankind might feel, think, or say to the contrary, Mill would insist on it that religion is an excrescence that ought to be abolished, even when it is said, that if there

such as can be literally acted up to, or contemplated and brooded over for the divine spirit they inculcate, and it would be almost impossible to find a candid or sane man that would object to them. The inconsistency, even absurdity, running through the writings of both the Mills, is very manifest here: in the elder for not practising, as is alleged, what he preached; and in the younger for speaking of the "great subjects of thought," when he ignored what are really such—God, our souls, and the aspiration towards, and belief in, a future state.—The Mills would not advance what *they* considered morality, nor, as I have stated above, say "where it is to be found, or how it can be made binding on men," if the morality contained in the Decalogue and New Testament is to be rejected.

were no God, it would be necessary to invent one, to assist in keeping mankind in order, for thus he describes a work of Comte :—

"The only value it seems to me to possess consists in putting an end [?] to the notion that no effectual moral authority can be maintained over society without the aid of religious belief" (p. 213).

Mill advises those "who, being qualified in point of knowledge, have on mature consideration satisfied themselves that the current opinions are not only false but hurtful, to make their dissent known" on the subject of religion. It would be interesting to have their religion (if they have any) explained to mankind, with the authority they have to support it; and greatly so to have been told what Mill wished to be done to improve the state of things he found existing around him. Even with the better kinds of sceptics, we generally, if not almost invariably, find that they have never investigated the origin or nature of the religion they object to. Thus in the case of Benjamin Franklin, who, when asked by Dr. Ezra Stiles for his opinion concerning Jesus of Nazareth, replied, when in his 85th year :—

"I think his system of morals and his religion, as he left them to us, the best the world ever saw or is like to see; but I apprehend it has received various corrupting changes [he does not say what these are], and I have, with most of the present Dissenters in England [?], some doubts as to his Divinity; though it is a question I do not dogmatize upon, having never studied it, and think it needless to busy myself with it now, when I expect soon an opportunity of knowing the truth with less trouble. I see no harm, however, in its being believed, if that belief has the good consequence, as probably it has, of making his doctrines more respected and more observed; especially as I do not perceive that the Supreme takes it amiss, by distinguishing the unbelievers in his government of the world with any peculiar marks of his displeasure." (*Parton, II.*, 615.*) [Ben. would have a theory of his own, Scripture or no Scripture.]

What Mill wrote of Comte in regard to political, social and physical things, is somewhat applicable to the Christian religion, in the case of sceptics who have "never studied it:"—

"I had fully agreed with him when he maintained that the mass of mankind, including even the rulers in all the practical departments of life, must, from the necessity of the case, accept most of their opinions on political and social matters, as they do on physical, from the authority of those who have bestowed more study on those subjects than they generally have it in their power to do" (p. 212).

---

* The creed given by Franklin on this occasion is interesting, but it must be remembered it was inhaled from the Christian religious and moral atmosphere in which he was born and reared; and it may, on that account, be called a pretty piece of Christian Paganism. He says :—

"Here is my creed. I believe in one God, the Creator of the universe. That he governs it by his providence. That he ought to be worshipped. That the most acceptable service we render to him is doing good to his other children. That the soul of man is immortal and will be treated with justice in another life, respecting its conduct in this. These I take to be the fundamental points in all sound religion, and I regard them as you do, in whatever sect I meet with them."

As he approached the very close of his life, he thus reasoned with a friend :—

"Death is as necessary to the constitution as sleep; we shall rise refreshed in the morning. The course of nature must soon put a period to my present mode of existence. This I shall submit to with the less regret, as having seen during a long life a good deal of this world, I feel a growing curiosity to become acquainted with some other; and can cheerfully, with filial confidence, resign my spirit to the conduct of that great and good Parent of mankind who created it, and who has so graciously protected and preserved me from my birth to the present hour."

There is a good deal of the "Red Indian" in Franklin's ideas about religion. He speaks of the soul of man being "treated with justice," which, it is prosumed, would include punishment.

Mill says of his father, that,

"After many struggles, he yielded to the conviction, that concerning the origin of things, nothing whatever can be known" (p. 39); and that "he impressed upon me from the first, that the manner in which the world came into existence, was a subject on which nothing was known" (p. 42).

There was no necessity for any "struggles" in a matter of this kind, or "impressing" such a conviction upon anyone, for anyone a very little instructed in the doctrines of Christianity is well aware of the fact, that the mind is a perfect blank on that subject; and that the information wanted can be found only in the Old and New Testaments. It would have been of more importance to have been told *when* James Mill underwent the struggles mentioned. Readers of the classics, like the Mills, could have found the same truth well stated by Socrates, when he said:—

"Regarding celestial matters, he dissuaded his disciples from becoming subtile speculators regarding the way the Deity contrived each of them. For he considered that this could never be discovered by man; nor did he believe that he acted gratefully to God, who scrutinized such points as he did not wish to make clearly known. He said, moreover, that he was in danger of losing his senses, who turned his mind anxiously upon these investigations, just as Anaxagoras lost his reason, who prided himself most in explaining by the power of his reason the plans of the deities."—*Zenophon's Memorabilia, English translation*, p. 203.

There is no evidence whatever to show that Mill ever examined the subject of religion in even the most crude form of its natural aspects: he seems merely to have echoed his father's sentiments, imbibed from him when a child, excepting that at that stage of his "intellectual and moral development," he tells us "that he at the same time took care that I should be acquainted with what had been thought by mankind on these impenetrable problems" (p. 43); which is decidedly inconsistent with what he had just said, that "it would have been wholly inconsistent with my father's ideas of duty to allow me to acquire impressions contrary to his convictions and feelings respecting religion" (p. 42). Mill the younger, in particular, seems to have lacked the faculty for feeling or judging on that subject; he certainly never had any religious belief, as he admitted; so that it sounds strange to hear *him* calling for a crusade against a subject about which he allows that "nothing whatever can be known." And it seems as strange for his father to speak of religion as being "not only false, but hurtful" (p. 45); and that "the most perfect conception of wickedness which the human mind can devise," is "embodied in what is commonly presented to mankind as the creed of Christianity" (p. 41); in which he was educated, at the expense of other people, and most solemnly promised, at the age of twenty-five, to preach and defend.

The proper attitude to be assumed by such a mind as Mill's towards the phenomena of animated and inanimated nature, was to drift quietly through life, looking at everything it met with, with the eye of a dumb animal. Even in the ordinary affairs of life, a little degree of reason and personal dignity should teach us to call nothing wrong unless we can show that it is wrong, and substitute something better for it; for how can a person say that a thing *is* wrong without doing that? Mill, in his so frequently, so persistently, and so prominently bringing his atheism before the world, resembled, at least in principle, the most common-placed, the most vulgar-minded (one might say blackguard) infidel, who does it with everyone, and on all occasions (except when his personal interests would suffer, and then he keeps very quiet on the subject), as if it were a thing that

could not rest on his mind, but must be thrown up, as a great relief to himself, and a positive nuisance to others. But in his case, he skulked through life like a thief, a conspirator, or an assassin, afraid of being apprehended by every one he met with, and only after his death, left his secret to the world. Fortunately, he had no knowledge of poisoning as one of the fine arts, for he has presented his drug in such a form and quantity, that both palate and stomach will reject it, to say nothing of its being correctly labeled.

John Stuart Mill, however, had a religion, or rather two religions, although he does not say that he had them at the same time. The first one he acquired by reading the *Traité de Législation*, and it is thus described:

"I now had opinions; a creed, a doctrine, a philosophy; in one among the best senses of the word, a religion; the inculcation and diffusion of which could be made the principal outward purpose of a life. And I had a grand [Utopian] conception laid before me of changes to be effected in the condition of mankind through that doctrine" (p. 67).

All of which, as we shall see, "went by the board" when he fell into the dumps, and was like to have made away with himself.

He makes several allusions, in very indefinite language, to religion among freethinkers, the best of them being "more genuinely religious, in the best sense of the word religion, than those who exclusively arrogate to themselves the title" (p. 46); such religion standing "for any graces of character, and not for mere dogma" (as if any one asserted that religion consisted in 'mere dogma'), and being "an ideal conception of a perfect being to which they habitually refer as the guide of their conscience"; who is neither the creator, preserver, nor governor of the world, whose habitation is nowhere imagined, whose attributes are not conceivable in detail, who exercises no control over man, and who, in short, has no existence but in the imagination of the creature, whose ideal will vary with its own personal peculiarities. But this is said only of the best class of unbelievers, and is not advanced as his own religion. When reviewing Comte, he expatiated on it in this manner:—

"Candid persons of all creeds may be willing to admit [which they certainly do not] that if a person has an ideal object [as Mill had in Mrs. Taylor, before and after she became his wife], his attachment and sense of duty towards which are able to control and discipline all his other sentiments and propensities, and prescribe to him a rule of life, that person has a religion; and though every one naturally prefers his own religion to any other, all must admit, that if the object of his attachment, and of this feeling of duty, is the aggregate of our fellow-creatures [Bentham's dogma, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number'], this religion of the infidel cannot in honesty and conscience be called an intrinsically bad one" [for the simple reason that, having no reference to the Creator, it is no religion at all].

Mill's other religion sprung from the death of Mrs. Taylor, who became his wife after a friendship of twenty-one years, while the wife of another man, and of whom we shall have something further to say. It is thus described:—

"Her memory is to me a religion, and her approbation the standard by which, summing up as it does all worthiness, I endeavour to regulate my life" (p. 251)

He does not say that *she* had any religion beyond the very indefinite and untrustworthy one, that may mean anything, of a

"Complete emancipation from every kind of superstition [such as?] (including that which attributes a pretended perfection to the order of nature and the universe), and an earnest protest against many things [what were they?] which are still part of the established constitution of society, . . . with a highly reverential nature" (p. 186).

In the matter of religion, as generally understood, they were apparently "birds of a feather," although it is difficult to believe that the mother of children could be an atheist, when we remember the exclamation of Eve, on the birth of Cain—an instinct common to womankind—that she had "gotten a man from the Lord." God the creator, preserver, and governor, was a being which Mill did not in any way recognize. *His* religion was directed to his goddess' memory (and memory only); and he almost exhausted the English language in her praises—praises as were perhaps never exceeded by the heathen, when addressing their ordinary deities. Indeed, he confessed his inability to fill the place of her hierophant.

To both the Mills the following prayer of the Pagan Epictetus would have been simply an abomination:—

"If death overtakes me in such a situation, it is enough for me if I can stretch out my hands to God, and say, 'The opportunities which I have received from thee of comprehending and obeying thy administration, I have not neglected. As far as in me lay, I have not dishonoured thee. See how I have used my perceptions; how my convictions. Have I at any time found fault with thee? Have I been discontented at thy dispensations, or wished them otherwise? Have I transgressed the relations of life? I thank thee that thou hast brought me into being. I am satisfied with the time that I have enjoyed the things which thou hast given me. Receive them back again, and distribute them as thou wilt; for they were all thine, and thou gavest them to me.'"—*Boston Edition*, 1865, p. 357.

And the following letter from another Pagan, Pliny the Consul, would have been no less offensive to them:—

"The lingering disorder of a friend of mine gave me occasion lately to reflect, that we are never so virtuous as when afflicted with sickness. Where is the man who, under the pain of any distemper, is either solicited by avarice or enflamed with lust? At such a season he is neither the slave of love, nor the fool of ambition; he looks with indifference upon the charms of wealth, and is contented with ever so small a portion of it, as being upon the point of leaving even that little. It is *then* he recollects there are gods, and that he himself is but a man: no mortal is *then* the object of his envy, his admiration or his contempt; and having no malice to gratify, the tales of slander excite not his attention; his dreams run only upon the refreshment of baths and fountains. These are the supreme objects of his thoughts and wishes, while he resolves, if he should recover, to pass the remainder of his days disengaged from the cares and business of the world; that is, in innocence and happiness. I may therefore lay down to you and myself a short rule, which the philosophers have endeavoured to inculcate at the expense of many words, and even many volumes, that 'we should realize in health those resolutions we form in sickness.'"—*Pliny, by Melmoth. II.*, p. 48.

This letter of Pliny is certainly very interesting on the subject of death, when he says, "It is then we recollect there are gods"; while Marcus Aurelius says, "Since it is possible that thou mayest depart this life this very moment, regulate every act and thought accordingly": sentiments that would have no meaning unless they referred to what St. Paul says when he speaks of men being, "through fear of death, all their life-time subject to bondage," in consequence of it being "appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Among the more intelligent of the heathen, the fear of future punishment was called superstition, and was left to be spoken of by the more ignorant of the people, however much the others may have felt without expressing it, or however much they may have done to shake the fear off them. And thus it was that Plato says:—

"When a man is about to die, the stories of future punishment, which he

had formerly ridiculed, trouble him with fears of their truth."—*Republic, lib.* 1, *chap.* 5.

I may give some more of the opinions of the Pagan philosophers on the subject of religion, as illustrating what human nature, apart from revelation, thought on that important question; premising that St. Paul said that "the world by wisdom knew not God," although its instincts were cultivated and developed in that direction; and that it is only in Christianity we can find his nature and our relations to him as fully explained as he has been pleased to do it. "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you," said the Apostle to the philosophers on Mars' Hill, in a city characterized by the utmost of human learning and culture, yet "wholly given to idolatry," as history, no less than Scripture, assures us.

"Concerning the gods, some affirm that there is no Deity; others, that he indeed exists, but is slothful, negligent, and without providential care; a third class admits both his being and his providence, but only in respect to great and heavenly objects, not earthly; a fourth recognizes him both in heaven and earth, but only in general, not individual matters; a fifth, like Ulysses and Socrates, says, 'I cannot be hid from thee in any of my motions.'"—*Epictetus, Boston*, 1865, p. 40.

"Do you expect the greatest of arts to be acquired by slight endeavours? And yet the principal doctrine of the philosophers is in itself short. If you have a mind to know it, read Zeno, and you will see. It is not a long story to say, 'Our end is to serve the gods,' and 'The essence of good consists in the proper use of the phenomena of existence.'"—*Ib.*, p. 62.

"The philosophers say that we are first to learn that there is a God; and that his providence directs the whole; and that it is not merely impossible to conceal from him our actions, but even our thoughts and emotions."—*Ib.*, p. 136.

"Amongst all mankind the first natural law is to venerate the gods."—*Socrates, by Zenophon. English translation*, p. 188.

"Things grounded on moral certainty from the common assent of mankind, as 'that there is a God; that parents are to be honoured.'"—*Quintilian. English translation, I.*, p 285.

"What land, what sea can he find where God is not? Wretched and miserable man! in what corner of the world canst thou so hide thyself as to think thou hast now escaped him?"—*Plutarch's Morals, by Goodwin, I.*, p. 172.

"The design of those that deny a God is to ease themselves of his fear."—*Ib.*, p. 169.

"Here then you see the foundation of this question clearly laid; for since it is the constant and universal opinion of mankind, independent of education, custom, or law, that there are gods, it must necessarily follow that this knowledge is implanted in our minds, or rather innate in us, ... for in this we have the concurrence, not only of almost all philosophers [there have always been atheists, like the Mills], but likewise of the ignorant and illiterate. For what nation, what people are there who have not, without any learning, a natural idea or premonition of a Deity, ... that is, an antecedent conception of the fact in the mind, without which nothing can be understood, inquired after, or discoursed on."—*Cicero on the Nature of the Gods, by Younge*, p. 17.

"If any one doubts this, I really do not understand why the same man may not also doubt whether there is a sun or not. For what can possibly be more evident than this? And if it were not a truth universally impressed on the minds of men, the belief in it would never have been so firm; nor would it have been, as it is, increased by length of years, nor would it have gathered strength and stability through every age."—*Ib.*, p. 45. "That there are gods, is never contested but by the most impious of men."—*Ib.*, p. 107.

"Among all the variety of animals, there is not one except man which retains any idea of a Divinity. And among men themselves, there is no nation so

savage and ferocious as not to admit the necessity of believing in a God, however ignorant they may be what sort of God they ought to believe in. From whence we conclude that every man must recognize a Deity, who has any recollection and knowledge of his own origin."—*Cicero on the Laws, by Younge*, p. 409.

"In truth we can scarcely reckon him a man whom neither the regular courses of the stars, nor the alterations of day and night, nor the temperature of the seasons, nor the productions that nature displays for his use and enjoyment, urge to gratitude towards heaven."—*Ib.*, p. 434.

Mill says:—

"There is no author to whom my father thought himself more indebted for his own mental culture, than Plato, or whom he more frequently recommended to young students. I can bear similar testimony in regard to myself" (p. 21). "My father's moral convictions, wholly dissevered from religion, were very much of the character of those of the Greek philosophers. . . . . Even at the very early age at which I read with him the Memorabilia of Zenophon, I imbibed from that work, and from his comments, a deep respect for the character of Socrates, who stood in my mind a model of ideal excellence. . . . . At a somewhat later period, the lofty moral standard exhibited in the writings of Plato operated upon me with great force" (p. 47).

But the arguments of these writers in favour of the Deity and the immortality of the soul seem to have had no effect upon either of them, for they read their writings *wholly dissevered from religion.* And the same can be said of the other ancient philosophers, excepting that his father's

"Standard of morals was Epicurean, inasmuch as it was utilitarian, taking as the exclusive test of right and wrong the tendency of actions to produce pleasure or pain" (p. 48), and of his own standard, he says; "I never, indeed, wavered in the conviction, that happiness is the test of all rules of conduct, and the end of life" (p. 142).

We have seen how Mill seems to have merely echoed his father's ideas on the subject of religion (with the exception that his wife's memory became one to him); and what has been just quoted, will show that he did the same in regard to one of the practical aspects of it. On both points he realized the homely proverb, "As the old cock crew, the young one learned." Their "standards of morals" are singular enough. We find in them no reference to *duties*, or virtue for its own sake, but a creed which might be extended to embrace the most swinish or the most devilish indulgences, if temporal pleasure and happiness are the only things to be sought after, and pain the only thing to be avoided. The old Epicurean creed, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," quoted by St. Paul, was an excellent one when compared with it, for that could not directly injure any one but him following it. Had we been told in what happiness or pleasure and pain consisted, we could have formed an idea of how far the pursuit of the one, or the avoidance of the other, was allowable. Our duties to God and man are the only real objects worthy of being aimed at, whatever the result; and the discharge of these is not likely to end in real pain, whatever of that we may unavoidably meet with in this transitory state. In the creed of the Mills, unexplained as it is, we can find no moral obligations to mankind individually, but merely the caprices or passions of the creature, that might attach to any action that the passing moment might dictate.

However much Mill recanted and recanted again his opinions, we do not find him canting on the subject of religion (for that he never had), but much in connection with the "aggregate of our fellow-creatures," but little or none with them individually, and of which the following are specimen expressions:—

Commencement of a new era in thought.

Delight in virtue or the public good.
Elevated standard of excellence.
Enthusiasm for ideal nobleness.
Excellence for its own sake.
Fundamental principles.
Genuine benevolence.
Good of mankind.
High intellectual and moral eminence.
Human improvement.
Ideal excellence.
Ideal nobleness.
Intellectual and moral development.
Intrinsic usefulness.
Larger and freer existence.
Lofty moral standard.
Love of justice.
Love of mankind.
Noble principles.
Religion of humanity.
Reverential admiration.
Sympathy with mankind.
Ultimate improvement.
Ultimate prospects of humanity.
Unselfish benevolence.
Vista of improvement.

It is interesting to hear that all these superexcellences are to be introduced by people like himself, for thus he writes :—

"I looked forward, through the present age of loud disputes, but generally weak convictions, to a future which shall unite the best qualities of the critical with the best qualities of the organic periods [what and when were these?]. . . . [when] they shall not, like all former and present creeds, religious, ethical, and political, require to be periodically thrown off and replaced by others" (p. 166). "I agreed with him [Comte] that the moral and intellectual ascendancy, once exercised by priests [and Christian pastors?], must in time pass into the hands of [Utopian] philosophers, and will naturally do so when they become sufficiently unanimous, and in other respects worthy to possess it" (p. 212). [Two very important conditions.]

How different is the spirit that breathes through the following letter of Sir David Brewster to Professor James Forbes, written on the 11th February, 1830, and to be found at page 60 of the life of the latter, published lately :—

"You will find that a life of science has in it no superiority to any other, unless it is pursued from a higher principle than the mere ambition of notoriety, and that a demagogue or a philosopher differs only in the objects of their selfishness. [How applicable this is to Mill!] As you will now have experienced how unsatisfying even the pursuit of knowledge is when insulated from higher objects, I hope, if you have not been fortunate enough to begin the study earlier, that you will devote yourself to the most extraordinary of all subjects, one which infinitely surpasses the mechanism of the heavens, or the chemistry of the material world, the revelation of your duty, and the destiny of man as contained in the Bible—a book which occupied the best hours of the manhood of Newton, of Locke, and of Euler."

The strongest reason given by the Pagan philosophers, or that can be advanced to-day, for the existence of God, is the existence of man himself; for the sentiment expressed by Cicero is an appeal to every intelligent being :—"Every man must recognize a Deity who has any recollection and knowledge of his own origin." To-day he is not, tomorrow he is conceived, and in nine months he is born, the most helpless of creatures, to appearance the sport of every circumstance as regards his preservation, and the time and mode of passing out of his earthly existence. What is said of him by the Psalmist is but the expression of the instinct of nature :—"I am fearfully and wonderfully made." "Thou art he that took me out of the womb." "I was cast upon thee from the womb; thou art my God from my mother's belly." "By thee have I been holden up from the womb; thou art he that took me out of my mother's bowels: my praise shall be continually of thee." Of this created being, who was originally "made a little lower than the angels," Job says:—"If I wait, the grave is mine house." "I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother, and my sister." "How much less

man, that is a worm, and the son of man, who is a worm."

Man's mode of coming into being is, as I have said, an appeal to every intelligent creature of more or less maturity of knowledge. It is all the more wonderful when it is considered that one generation might have been the children instead of the parents of the other, so far as the knowledge, choice, and power of the blind instruments of the perpetuation of the race are concerned; for the subject is as incomprehensible to them, with all their endowments, if left to themselves, as if they were the most irrational of beings. Hence the natural and easy transition to what St. Paul said to the Athenians:—"For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring" (Acts xvii. 28). If our present existence, in every possible aspect of it, is so utterly incomprehensible to us, why object to one in a future state, when it seems but the complement of the present one, as it is the desire—the hope and consolation — of virtuous and pious, or even thoughtful men? And since our bodies emanate from nothing, why speak of the impossibility, or even the unlikelihood of a resurrection, which has now as it had of old this effect, as experienced by the Apostle:—"And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter" (verse 32). And if we reject the Scriptures, what would people, brought up in a Christian community, accept in their place, beyond their own ignorance, helplessness and misery?

The Mills could not have been altogether devoid of the instincts common to their kind, when they spent their lives in seeking or wishing to obliterate from the mind of man, as well as their own, the sense of a knowledge of, and a reliance on, the author of their beings. Both of them seem to have been singularly ill-made-up characters—a species of wild men, in short; the elder being the strangest phenomenon of the two, inasmuch as he was carefully trained and licensed to preach Christianity, and doubtless did preach it. Both were really ashamed and afraid to avow before the world that they did not believe in God; while others, often the best and most pious of men, are half-ashamed, half-afraid, to avow to everyone how much they *do* believe in him, and in the revelation which he has made of himself to his creatures.

The opinions of so many of the wise and great men of the earth, in addition to the instincts of their kind, as to the existence of God, had no effect on the Mills; and while other men may desire to hold themselves entirely at his disposal, we could imagine *them* fretting over the mysteries of their being and destiny, and the "nature of things," like hyenas pacing to and fro in their cages. If they could have succeeded in suppressing in their breasts all thought of the Deity, and their responsibilities to him, they would have to some extent realized their creeds; that of the elder being that "the exclusive test of right and wrong [is] the tendency of actions to produce pleasure or pain" (p. 48); and that of the younger, that "happiness is the test of all rules of conduct, and the end of life" (p. 142).

II.

HIS EDUCATION.

In regard to his education, Mill writes:—

"I have thought that in an age in which education and its improvement are the subject of more, if not of profounder study than at any former period of English history, it may be useful that there should be some record of an education which was unusual and remark-

able [as it doubtless was], and which, whatever else it may have done, has proved how much more than is commonly supposed may be taught, and well taught, in those early years which, in the common modes of what is called instruction, are little better than wasted" (p. 1).

His education was given him by his father, who, "with no resource but the precarious one of writing in periodicals, married and had a large family" (p. 3): "partly because of the peculiar abilities that the boy displayed from the first, partly because he could not afford to procure for him elsewhere such teaching as he was able himself to give him" (*Bourne*). We have here an illustration of the great want of judgment that stares out in almost every part of the Autobiography, when he tells us that *this* education given him *at home*, could be useful to the world as an example how children should be instructed. What he says rather reveals an intense self-worship in the narration of his so-called wonderfully precocious acquirements. Most of people will think that the kind of instruction given Mill, and his absolute seclusion from associations with his kind, would turn out the vast majority of children of even good parts so many imbeciles, if not idiots. It would, indeed, be difficult to find another such instance of education, as regards instruction and treatment, more suited to guard against such in the future, or that would prove more offensive to the ordinary instincts of human nature. It sounds odd to hear it said that the means followed by the world at large, in having their children taught in the "common modes," are "little better than wasted." That was a subject of which Mill had no personal knowledge; and the absurdity of the remark shows that he never took the trouble to inform himself in regard to it, otherwise he would not have advanced an opinion in the absolute and dogmatical way he has done.

We are told that he began Greek at three years old, and before he remembered it, but did not commence Latin until his eighth year. At that time, he says, he had read Herodotus, Xenophon, Diogenes Laertius, Lucian, Isocrates, and the first six dialogues of Plato; and Robertson, Hume, Gibbon, Watson's Philip the Second and Third, Hooke's History of Rome, Rollin, Langhorne's Plutarch, Burnet's History of his Own Times, etc.

"In these frequent talks about the books I read, he [his father] used, as opportunity offered, to give me explanations and ideas respecting civilization, government, morality, mental cultivation, which he required me afterwards to restate to him in my own words" (p. 8).

From his eighth to his twelfth year he read, in whole or in part, Virgil, Horace, Phædrus, Livy, Sallust, Ovid, Terence, Lucretius, Cicero, Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, etc., etc.

"Aristotle's Rhetoric . . . . my father made me study with particular care, and throw the matter of it into synoptic tables. During the same years I learnt elementary geometry and algebra thoroughly" (p. 12).

He successively composed a Roman History, an Abridgment of the Ancient Universal History, a History of Holland, and, in his eleventh and twelfth years, a History of the Roman Government, large enough to make an octavo volume, in which he "discussed all the constitutional points as they arose" (p. 13), and "vindicated the Agrarian Laws on the evidence of Livy, and upheld, to the best of my ability, the Roman Democratic party" (p. 14). From about his twelfth year, he began on "thoughts themselves," starting in logic with the Organon, and several of the Latin treatises on the scholastic logic; and he gives a list of his high studies. Some of the principal orations of Demosthenes he "read

several times over, and wrote out, by way of exercise, a full analysis of them" (p. 20). In 1819, when thirteen years old, his father took him "through a complete course of political economy" (p. 27), and he "went through the whole extent of the science" (p. 28), and "read Ricardo, giving an account daily of what I read, and discussing, in the best manner I could, the collateral points which offered themselves in our progress" (p. 28). This wonderfully precocious boy-philosopher goes on to say:—

"I remember at some time in my thirteenth year, on my happening to use the word idea, he [his father] asked me what an idea was; and expressed some displeasure at my ineffectual efforts to define the word. I recollect, also, his indignation at my using the common expression, that something was true in theory, but required correction in practice; and how, after making me vainly strive to define the word theory, . . . I had shown unparalleled ignorance" (p. 32). "He strove to make the understanding not only *go along* with every step of the teaching, but, if possible, *precede it* [!] . . . . As far as I can trust my remembrance, I acquitted myself very lamely in this department; my recollection of such matters is almost wholly of failures, hardly ever of success. It is true the failures were often in things in which success, in so early a stage of my progress, was almost impossible" (p. 32).

There is much, at pages 30–32, on this subject, at such variance with human experience, and so contradicted by himself, as just illustrated, that it is difficult to think how he could have put it on record. Thus he says, "Mine, however, was not an education of cram" (p. 31), when it was nothing but cram, and such cram that it was little better than a crime for his father to perpetrate it on him. That can hardly be called cram which consists in filling a child's memory with words without it understanding them, compared to torturing one like Mill in trying to get him to comprehend so many books and subjects, which, after *ten* years of such cramming, did not yield the fruit of eliciting any kind of definition of such simple words as idea and theory! Memory and general instruction are the principal things to be attended to in the education of a child of a certain age; while its understanding of what is taught it, and of things in general, is to be cultivated as circumstances will warrant, for the reason that the mind, like everything else in nature, must grow, and must not be forced.

He speaks of the "wretched waste of so many precious years as are spent in acquiring the modicum of Latin and Greek commonly taught to school-boys" (p. 30). Like perhaps everything else he finds fault with, he does not say in what respect this is wrong, or suggest anything better to take its place. No doubt more time than is necessary is often, if not generally, given to Latin and Greek, when they are to be of almost no use in after life, and when both become nearly forgotten; their main or only use then being, like mathematics and such subjects, to remind people that they *did* learn and understand such in their youth, if they have now forgotten them, so as to prevent them having an undefined and magnified sense of ignorance, and consequent diffidence, had they never known anything about them. A considerable part of the time spent on Latin and Greek could, in the great majority of cases, be profitably given to modern languages and more advanced branches of their own language, and some of the simple aspects of science of various kinds, and especially to writing or copying subjects on paper, to improve the handwriting, spelling, the use of capitals and punctuation, command of language, style, etc., for use in *any* calling in life. Education, indeed, should be uniform up to a certain point, when it should diverge to suit the purpose it is required to serve. As the classics are taught in

some public schools, in large classes, perhaps a third of the scholars do well, a third fairly, and the other third very indifferently, if not nominally. But all that does not in any way concern Mill's father's style of tuition and discipline, which was *private*, for it is of the *capacity* of children he writes, when he says :—

"If I had been by nature extremely quick of apprehension, or had possessed a very accurate and retentive memory, or were of a remarkably active and energetic character, the trial would not be conclusive ; but in all these natural gifts I am rather below than above par" (p. 30) ; and illustrating his profound ignorance of human nature in its undeveloped state, he adds : "What I could do, could assuredly be done by any boy or girl of average capacity and healthy physical constitution" (p. 30).

The common instinct of humanity proclaims such an idea an absurdity. Still, he considered himself fortunate by his early training, in "starting with an advantage of a quarter of a century over my contemporaries" (p. 31), when, at the age of *thirteen*, with all his "advantages," he could make nothing of the meaning of the words idea and theory.* And yet he mentions that in his *eleventh* year he read the manuscript of his father's History of India, while the author corrected the proofs, and adds :—

"The number of new ideas which I received from this remarkable book [apparently at that time], and the impulse and stimulus as well as guidance given to my thoughts by its criticisms and disquisitions on society and civilization in the Hindoo part, on institutions and the acts of governments in the English part, made my early familiarity with it eminently useful to my subsequent progress" (p. 24).

It is difficult to reconcile such glaring inconsistencies, unless we allow for Mill being a long way "below par" in the matter of memory, as he admitted, or for his unsound, erratic and unreliable judgment, when he depended entirely on himself. We could also find a solution of the mystery in bragging, in consequence of his never having any religious belief, or of his never having admitted of the existence of God, and refusing, in common with his wife, to be bound by "the ordinances of society, on a subject so entirely personal" (p. 229), and that hurt no one—"violations which, whether in themselves right or wrong, are capable of being committed by persons in every other respect loveable or admirable" (p. 188); since none of these infringed upon the Benthamic "dogma or creed, law or gospel"—"the greatest happiness of the greatest number" (which was sound enough, to a certain extent, as to the laws that should be made for a country), and his own, "in his conviction of which he never wavered," that "happiness is the test of all rules of conduct, and the end of life" (p. 142).

Mill's own words were extremely applicable to himself to the last, in spite of his disclaimer, when he wrote :—

"Most boys or youths who have had much knowledge drilled into them [what boys were these?] have their mental capacities not strengthened, but overlaid by it. They are crammed with mere facts, and with the opinions or phrases of other people, and these are accepted as a substitute for the power to form opinions of their own: and thus the sons of eminent fathers, who have spared no pains in their education, so often grow up mere parroters of what they have learnt, incapable of using their minds except in the furrows traced for them" (p. 31).

We will by and by see that, to the last, Mill was constantly drawing, not his facts and generalizing him-

* Mill could have said of himself, in the child's doggerel slightly modified,

"Through the big books and through the big books I ran,
And little as I was, I beat a large man."

self from them, but his *opinions*, from one source and then from another, and, generally with a rush, modifying, changing, and "going back" on them; often falling into ideas that were impractical, utopian, fantastic, and pernicious, especially when he attempted to strike out for himself in matters that called for the exercise of common sense or knowledge of the world. At first it was the "youthful fanaticisms" and the "great excesses," etc., of a "reasoning machine"—always "everything by turns and nothing long." He resembled a dog that is now on the scent, and now off it, "taking the back-track," and running this way and then that way, and getting into holes from which he requires to be drawn or dug out. He was constantly tumbling around the "arena of thought"; now he would tumble into a chair, and no sooner was he in it, or seemed to be in it, than he would tumble out of it. Here is what he says of himself:—

"I found the fabric of my old and *taught* opinions giving way in many fresh places, and I never allowed it to fall to pieces, but was incessantly weaving it anew" (p. 156). "It has also seemed to me that in an age of transition in opinions, there may be somewhat both of interest and of benefit [as there doubtless is] in noting the successive phases of any mind which was always pressing forward, equally ready to learn and to unlearn, either from its own thoughts or from those of others" (p. 2).

It is interesting to note his opinion of his father's temper and general deportment while instructing his children at home, which necessity, as we have seen, made him do; so that the instruction, or the way in which it was given, could be of little or no use, as an example, in the teaching of children at schools.

"My father, in all his teaching, demanded of me not only the utmost that I could do, but much that I could by no possibility have done" (p. 5). "One of the most impatient of men" (p. 6). "I was continually incurring his displeasure by my inability to solve difficult problems, for which he did not see that I had not the necessary previous knowledge" (p. 12). "Most of these reflections were beyond my capacity of full comprehension at the time" (p. 21). "The particular attention which he paid to elocution (in which his own excellence was remarkable) made this reading aloud to him a most painful task. Of all things which he required me to do, there was none which I did so constantly ill, or in which he so perpetually lost his temper with me. . . . . These rules he strongly impressed on me, and took me severely to task for every violation of them; but I even then remarked (though I did not venture to make the remark to him), that though he reproached me when I read a sentence ill, and *told* me how I ought to have read it, he never, by reading it himself, *showed* me how it ought to be read. A defect running through his otherwise admirable [?] modes of instruction, as it did through all his modes of thought, was that of trusting too much to the intelligibleness of the abstract, when not embodied in the concrete" (p. 23)."* "He was often, and much beyond reason, provoked by my failures in cases where success could not have been expected; but in the main his method was right [?], and it succeeded" (p. 29). "The element which was chiefly deficient in his moral relation to his children was that of tenderness" (p. 51). "If we consider further that he was in the trying position of sole teacher, and add to this that his temper was constitutionally irritable, it is impossible not to feel true pity for [children rather than] a father who did, and strove to do, so much for his children, who would have so valued their affection, yet who must have been constantly feeling that fear of him was drying it up at its source. This was no longer the case later in life, and with his younger children. They loved him tenderly; and if I cannot say so much of myself, I was always loyally devoted to him. As regards my own education, I hesitate

* In regard to his power as a speaker, Mill says:—"I never, indeed, acquired real fluency, and had always a bad and ungraceful delivery; but I could make myself listened to" (p. 129).

[why so?] to pronounce whether I was more a loser or gainer by his severity. It was not such as to prevent me from having a happy childhood" (p. 52).

"I went through the whole process of preparing my Greek lessons in the same room and at the same table at which he was writing" (p. 6). "In my eighth year I commenced learning Latin, in conjunction with a younger sister, to whom I taught it as I went on, and who afterwards repeated the lessons to my father; and from this time, other sisters and brothers being successively added as pupils, a considerable part of my day's work consisted of this preparatory teaching. It was a part which I greatly disliked; the more so as I was held responsible for the lessons of my pupils in almost as full a sense as for my own. . . . . In other respects, the experience of my boyhood is not favourable to the plan of teaching children by means of one another. The teaching, I am sure, is very inefficient as teaching, and I well know that the relation between teacher and taught is not a good moral discipline to either" (p. 10).

"It is evident that this, among many other of the purposes of my father's scheme of education, could not have been accomplished, if he had not carefully kept me from having any great amount of intercourse with other boys. He was earnestly bent upon my escaping, not only the corrupting influence which boys exercise over boys, but the contagion of vulgar modes of thought and feeling [!]; and for this he was willing that I should pay the price [a heavy one] of inferiority in the accomplishments which school-boys in all countries chiefly cultivate. The deficiencies in my education were principally in the things which boys learn from being turned out to shift for themselves, and from being brought together in large numbers. . . . I could do no feats of skill or physical strength, and knew none of the ordinary bodily exercises.* . . . No holidays were allowed. . . . . I had no boy companions. . . . . I consequently remained long, and in a less degree have always remained, inexpert in anything requiring manual dexterity; my mind, as well as my hands, did its work very lamely when it was applied, or ought to have been applied, to the practical details which, as they are the chief interest of life to the majority of men, are also the things in which whatever mental capacity [or common sense] they have, chiefly shows itself: I was constantly meriting reproof by inattention, inobservance, and general slackness of mind in matters of daily life. My father was the extreme opposite in these particulars [for he was brought up at a totally different school]: his senses and mental faculties were always on the alert; he carried decision and energy of character in his whole manner and into every action of life: and this, as much as his talents, contributed to the strong impression which he always made upon those with whom he came into personal contact. But the children of energetic parents frequently grow up unenergetic, because they lean on their parents, and the parents are energetic for them [and consequently spoil them]. The education which my father gave me was in itself much more fitted for training me to *know* [like a 'parroter'] than to *do*. Not that he was unaware of my deficiencies; both as a boy and as a youth I was incessantly smarting under his severe admonitions on the subject [as did the Israelites when compelled by Pharaoh to make bricks without straw]. There was anything but insensibility or tolerance on his part towards such shortcomings [!]:* but, while he saved me from the demoralizing effects [and manly influences] of school life, he made no effort to provide me with any sufficient substitute [what was it?] for its practicalizing influences. Whatever qualities he himself, probably, had acquired, without difficulty or special

* Such exercises were, doubtless, forbidden him by his father, who seems to have laid down a style of life for him to follow, from which there was no appeal, although that is not expressly stated. During his absence on the Continent, when about fifteen, he seems to have attempted to make up for his early want of bodily exercises, and when he could indulge in them away from the control of his father, for he says:—"During this residence in France . . . I took lessons in various bodily exercises, in none of which, however, I made any proficiency" (p. 57).

* Mill seems to have intended to say, "anything but insensibility or *in*tolerance." There was anything but *sensibility* or *tolerance* in his father's actions, as described.

training [beyond that of the school, the university, his tutorship, and his intercourse with his fellow-creatures] he seems to have supposed that I ought to acquire as easily [although reared like a bird in a cage]. He had not, I think, bestowed the same amount of thought and attention on this as on most other branches of education [?]; and here, as well as in some other points of my tuition, he seems to have [*seems* to have!] expected effects without causes (p. 37).

We are told that his father "most anxiously guarded against" his son acquiring *self-conceit*, and kept him "with extreme vigilance" from being praised, so that he did not become aware that his attainments were anything unusual at his age, and in such ignorance on the subject, that he "did not estimate himself at all." In speaking of his father, he says, when in his fourteenth year:—

"From his own intercourse with me I could derive none but a very humble opinion of myself" (p. 32). "He wound up by saying that whatever I knew more than others could not be ascribed to any merit in me [even in standing the cramming], but to the very unusual advantage which had fallen to my lot of having a father who was able to teach me [after being himself taught at the expense of strangers] and willing to give the necessary trouble and time [or let the family grow up so many barbarians]; that it was no matter of praise to me [but all to himself] if I knew more than those who had not had a similar advantage, but the deepest disgrace to me if I did not" (p. 34). "They, as I have since found, thought me greatly and disagreeably self-conceited, probably because I was disputatious, and did not scruple to give direct contradictions to things which I heard said. I suppose I acquired this bad habit from having been encouraged in an unusual degree to talk on matters beyond my age, and with grown persons, while I never had inculcated on me the usual respect for them. My father did not correct this ill-breeding and impertinence, probably from not being aware of it, for I was always too much in awe of him to be otherwise than extremely subdued and quiet in his presence" (p. 34). Yet "he was full of anecdote, a hearty laugher, and, when with people whom he liked, a most lively and amusing companion" (p. 102).

Among the books which Mill read in his childhood, he says:—

"At this time I also read the whole of Tacitus, Juvenal, and Quintilian. The latter . . . . is a kind of encyclopædia of the thoughts of the ancients on the whole field of education and culture; and I have retained through life many valuable ideas which I can distinctly trace to my reading of him, even at that early age" (p. 21).

Had he read Quintilian to any advantage, he would have found stated at length, the many advantages a boy derives from a public school education over one given him by a private tutor; which would have completely disposed of almost all he says in regard to his so-called early advantages. He would also have found the following remarks very applicable to himself:—

"How shall he learn what we call 'common sense,' when he sequesters himself from society, which is natural not only to men, but to mute animals" (*Patsall, I.* p. 26). "It is more advisable . . . that a show may not be made of studies which are still in a crude state. For hence arises a neglect in taking pains, and a foundation is laid for effrontery, and what is attended with very bad consequences, presumption anticipates abilities" (*Ib.*, II., p. 385).

Mill wrote of himself when fourteen years old:—

"I was not at all aware that my attainments were anything unusual at my age [completely isolated as he was kept from his kind] . . . I never thought of saying to myself, I am, or I can do, so and so. I neither estimated myself highly nor lowly; I did not estimate myself at all" (p. 33), [although he added that others thought him "greatly and disagreeably self-conceited"].

It is interesting to notice how this cage-bred bird, which had been taught many things in its confine-

ment, made use of its wings on being set at liberty, totally ignorant of the outside world. We find him saying of himself, when fifteen and a half years old, that he "had what might truly be called an object in life—to be a reformer of the world" (p. 132). For this, his father was doubtless mainly responsible, for he looked on "his son John" as a wonderful child, destined to do some great things in the world; a kind of John the Baptist, in *his* way of thinking, who would at least "build the bridges and clear the paths" for others, and connect their thoughts with his (and doubtless his father's) "general system of thought" (p. 244).

It is also interesting to notice that Mill kept his son aloof from the "corrupting influence which boys exercise over boys," the "demoralizing effects of school life," and the "contagion of vulgar modes of thought and feeling," when even royalty will send its children to public educational establishments, for the benefit of being initiated in some of the ways of the world, which must be done in youth, to speak of nothing else. This appears singular when we consider the birth and rearing of Mill himself, who was brought up on the humblest of Scotch fare—"taties and kail, parritch and skim or kirn milk"—and went barefooted during a good part of the year, and used his jacket-sleeve as his only handkerchief. And if the charity by which he was educated went no further than the instruction, his "provender" while at college would, in all probability, be confined for the most part to his meal-bag.

It cannot be said that James Mill was a fit and proper person to be intrusted with the bringing-up of children. He would, doubtless, have made an excellent teacher or drill-master in certain branches of education in an institution presided over by a man of judgment and humanity, who would have allowed him no discretion in their management, beyond instructing them in their lessons or the subjects to be taught them.* John Stuart Mill's education, in the proper sense of the word, really began after he left his father, of whom he stood in constant dread to the last, as if he had him always after him with a stick. It is noticeable how he picked it up "about town"—here, there, and everywhere—undoing much of his previous instruction—and as much as possible away from his father's supervision or influence. The latter in some respects resembled a "bearded Savoyard," whose calling is to "teach" animals which have the misfortune to find their way to his establishment for that purpose. The education which he gave his son was devoid of everything connected with the imagination and the heart. How the son gradually shook himself clear of him is thus related, when he was about twenty-six years old:—

"My father's tone of thought and feel-

* Divinity students, in Scotland especially, labour under great disadvantages in gaining a knowledge of the world by the time they have otherwise prepared themselves to assume their positions in it. They have to isolate themselves to a great extent from their fellow-creatures, owing to the nature of their calling and the peculiarities of society; their associations with them being confined for the most part to some of the trifling amenities of life, where everything presents itself in its most favourable aspect; so that when they are about twenty-five years old they have had little or no *real* commerce with their kind. And there is no chair at the university to teach them "worldly wisdom," to make up the loss. They thus lose at least *eight* years of the best part of their lives for acquiring the most important part of knowledge. During all that time they are presumed to have been studying the "eternal verities," to the great neglect of what strictly refers to this world. Hence they assume their positions with a sufficiency of learning, but with a deficiency of the knowledge of their duties relating to practical life. If the student belongs to a poor or hum-

ing I now felt myself at a greater distance from: greater, indeed, than a full and calm explanation and reconsideration on both sides might have shown to exist in reality. But my father was not one with whom calm and full explanations on fundamental points of doctrine could be expected, at least with one whom he might consider as, in some sort, a deserter from his standard. Fortunately we were almost always in strong agreement on the political questions of the day, which engrossed a large part of his interest and of his conversation. On the matters of opinion on which we differed, we talked little. He knew that the habit of thinking for myself, which his mode of education had fostered, sometimes led me to opinions different from his [but not on the subject of religion], and he perceived from time to time [the business must have been cautiously gone about] that I did not always tell him *how* different. I expected no good, but only pain to both of us, from discussing our differences; and I never expressed them when he gave utterance to some opinion or feeling repugnant to mine, in a manner which would have made it disingenuousness on my part to remain silent" (p. 180).

It is certainly "useful that there should be some record of an education which was unusual and remarkable," to guard humanity against the ungodliness, the want of judgment, and the unnatural treatment or cruelty displayed in it, and but for which John Stuart Mill would doubtless have turned out, in some respects, a different man from what he did.

III.

A CRISIS IN HIS HISTORY.

We have seen what a singular training John Stuart Mill received from his father in the important questions of religion, education, and social life, so poorly calculated to qualify him for the real battle of life, and the law, for which he was originally intended. He informs us, as we have seen, that when fifteen he "had what might truly be called an object in life—to be a reformer of the world," when he had been brought up almost completely isolated from it, at least to such an extent as was apt to unfit him for taking

---

ble class in society, his isolation from it is apt to be greater than that of the late Dr. Thomas Guthrie, who started with a fair social position and training, example and associations, to say nothing of his natural gifts of observation and improvement in matters outside of his professional aspirations. It was fifteen years after he first went to college that he got a church, during five years of which, after he was licensed, he had "knocked about" a good deal, besides residing and studying in Paris, and acting in his twenty-six and twenty-seventh years as agent or manager of a branch bank, which he described as "two busy, but not lost, years in that employment." And he says:—"That, in point of fact, was not the least valuable part of my training and education. I became in this way conversant both with mercantile and agricultural affairs; and those who, both in the country and the town, afterwards became my people, did not respect me the less when they found their minister was something else than 'a fine bodie,' who knew no more about the affairs, the hopes and disappointments, and temptations, and trials of men engaged in the business of the world than any old wife, or the 'man in the moon'" (*Autobiography*, p. 107).

There are many ways in which students of divinity can acquire a little more knowledge of the world than they do, if they will but avail themselves of them. Indeed, "serpentine wisdom" is not only allowed, but commanded. Romanists have a plan of their own in these matters. What they aim at is to make their students *priests*, the most important part of whose work is to *manage* their people.

James Mill seems to have been a student like those described, perhaps a "boorish cub that was licked into shape," as Dr. Thomas Guthrie expressed it, whose time was exclusively given to his books. He would acquire little knowledge as a tutor beyond the ways of polite society, and have much of his Forfarshire roughness rubbed off him. He seems to have chosen a tutorship rather than a public school, for, had he taken the latter, he would have lost caste, and run a much greater risk of never getting a church. Had the gentlemen and noblemen who employed him as a tutor known of his ideas on religion, they would sooner have introduced a viper to the bosom of their families than had anything to do with him.

his own part in it in some things. He missed the most valuable part of life for acquiring the foundation of real knowledge, in being separated from his kind; but that could have been to a great extent amended by his after intercourse with the world, however limited, and by his connection with the India House, had he not shown what appears to have been a natural deficiency in that respect; at least, he does not seem to have endeavoured to acquire that very important part of one's education by such means as presented themselves; and the deficiency remained with him to the last. His intercourse with his fellow-creatures was at first limited to a very few grown-up people, who visited his father (p. 53); and when he went anywhere it was generally with his father, which kept him from associating with others. He paid a visit of upwards of a year to France, before he had any experience of English life, or "knowledge of God and good manners," and returned with some crude ideas of things in both countries.

"At this point concluded what can properly be called my lessons: when I was about fourteen, I left England [for France] for more than a year; and after my return, though my studies went on under my father's general direction, he was no longer my school-master" (p. 29). "I returned to England in July, 1821, and my education resumed its ordinary course" (p. 61). "Under my father's directions my studies were carried into the higher branches of analytic psychology" (p. 68). "Having so little experience of English life, and the few people I knew being mostly such as had public objects, . . . I could not then know or estimate the difference between this manner of existence [the English] and that of a people like the French" (p. 58). "All these things [difference between English and French life] I did not perceive till long afterwards" (p. 59).

He says that one of his greatest amusements during part of his childhood was experimental science, without ever seeing an experiment; and that he devoured treatises on chemistry before he attended a lecture or saw an experiment (p. 17). In the winter of 1821–2, he read on Roman Law, Roman Antiquities, and a considerable portion of Blackstone; then a "Course of Benthamism," Locke's Essays, Hartley's Observations on Man, some of the British Philosophers, etc.

"In the summer of 1822, I wrote my first argumentative essay" (p. 71). "After this I continued to write papers on subjects often very much beyond my capacity" (p. 72). [A point worthy of notice.] "I had now also begun to converse, on general subjects, with the instructed men with whom I came in contact" (p. 72). In 1822–3 he "formed the plan of a little society to be composed of young men agreeing in fundamental principles — acknowledging *utility* as their standard in ethics and politics" (p. 79). [An odd standard in *morals*.]

In May, 1823, when seventeen years old, he was engaged by the East India Company, in the office of Examiner of India Correspondence, immediately under his father, who apparently would hardly let him out of his sight, "with the understanding that I should be employed from the beginning in preparing drafts of despatches [from the dictation of others, it is presumed], and be thus trained up as a successor to those who then filled the higher departments of the office" (p. 82). And he says:—"In 1856, I was promoted to the rank of chief of the office in which I had served for upwards of thirty-three years. . . . I held this office as long as it continued to exist, being a little more than two years" (p. 249). For a few years after his appointment, he spent his month's vacation at his father's house in the country, and after that on the Continent, "chiefly in pedestrian excursions, with some one or more of the young men who were my chosen companions; and at a later period in longer

journeys or excursions, alone or with friends." Then he began to write in the Papers, soon after which followed the foundation of the *Westminster Review*.

There was an event in the history of Mill, described at great length, which would have been interesting had it been given with sufficient accuracy, as to its cause and cure, to have made it intelligible. He styles it "A crisis in my mental history," and introduces it in this way:—

"From the winter of 1821 [when he was fifteen years of age] . . . I had what might truly be called an object in life—to be a reformer of the world. My conception of my own happiness was entirely identified with this object" (p. 132). But in the year 1826 "I was in a dull state of nerves, such as everybody is occasionally liable to . . ; the state, I should think, in which converts to Methodism usually are, when smitten by their first 'conviction of sin' [as if *he* knew anything about *that* subject]. In this frame of mind it occurred to me to put the question directly to myself: 'Suppose that all your objects in life were realized; that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to [!] could be completely effected at this very instant; would this be a great joy and happiness to you?'" (p. 133.)

This was a trifling enough question to be asked of himself by a lad so inexperienced in the ways of the world, and which would have had little or no effect on a young man differently brought up; or rather, his experience or common sense would have prevented him asking it at all. If he had inquired about God, his soul, and its future destiny—calling in question all his father had taught him on these subjects—we could have understood his allusion to "converts to Methodism when smitten by their first conviction of sin." That was a subject about which he was evidently profoundly ignorant, and apparently as indifferent; nor does it appear, in his many allusions to religion, that he believed he even had a soul that would exist after leaving the body, whether to be saved or lost, or a God to be accountable to. But the odd question he asked himself, he answered thus:—

"An irrepressible self-consciousness distinctly answered, 'No.' At this my heart sank within me: the whole foundation on which my life was constructed fell down. All my happiness was to have been found in the continual pursuit of this end. The end had ceased to charm, and how could there ever again be an interest in the means? I seemed to have nothing to live for. At first I hoped that the cloud would pass away of itself; but it did not. A night's sleep, the sovereign remedy for the smaller vexations of life, had no effect on it. I awoke to a renewed consciousness of the woful fact. I carried it with me into all companies, into all occupations. Hardly anything had power to cause me even a few minutes' oblivion of it. For some months the cloud seemed to grow thicker and thicker" (p. 134). "In vain I sought relief from my favourite books, . . . and I became persuaded that my love of mankind, and of excellence for its own sake, had worn itself out" (p. 135), [in doing what?]

"If I had loved anyone sufficiently [notwithstanding his 'love of mankind'] to make confiding my griefs a necessity, I should not have been in the condition I was [rather an odd idea]. . . . But there was no one on whom I could build the faintest hope of such assistance. My father, to whom it would have been natural to me to have recourse in any practical difficulties, was the last person [excepting a priest] to whom, in such a case as this, I looked for help. Everything convinced me that he had no knowledge of any such mental state as I was suffering from; and that even if he could be made to understand it, he was not the physician who could heal it. My education, which was wholly his work, had been conducted without any regard to the possibility of its ending in this result; and I saw no use in giving him the pain of thinking that his plans had failed, when the failure was probably irremediable, and, at all events, beyond the power of *his* remedies. Of other friends, I had at that time none to whom I had any hope of making my condition intelligible.

[Where was the family physician?] It was, however, abundantly intelligible to myself; and the more I dwelt upon it the more hopeless it appeared" (p. 135).

Then for four pages (136 to 140) he goes on to philosophize on the phenomenon, and the cause of it, saying far more than can be inserted here; but the following are the principal words used, taking them in their order, which, as now given, are nearly as intelligible as Mill's four pages on the question treated:—

Course of study, mental and moral feelings and qualities, associations, love and hope, pleasure, action, contemplation, pain, ideas, education, experience, corollary, associations of the salutary class, retrospect, instruments, praise and blame, reward and punishment, intense associations, desires, aversions, artificial and casual, intense and inveterate, practically indissoluble, natural tie, habitual exercise, power of analysis, incredulity, natural laws, complements and correctives, prejudice, dissolving force, permanent sequences, sympathy, object of existence, dissolving influence of analysis, intellectual cultivation, precocious and premature analysis, inveterate habit, *blasé* and indifferent, heavy dejection, melancholy winter.*

"The idiosyncrasies of my education had given to the general phenomenon a special character, which made it seem the natural effect of causes that it was hardly possible for time to remove [although it went away of its own accord]. I frequently asked myself, if I could, or if I was bound to go on living, when life must be passed in this manner. I generally answered to myself that I did not think I could possibly bear it beyond a year. [Here we would have expected he would have made away with himself.] When, however, not more than half that duration of time had elapsed, a small ray of light broke in upon my gloom" (p. 140).

The reader will doubtless be anxious to learn how he got released from this "purgatory on earth," without a prayer being offered, or a miracle wrought, for the purpose, since no remedy seems to have been resorted to to dispel the evil spirit that possessed him. It was in this way:—

"I was reading, accidentally, *Marmontel's Memoires*, and came to the passage which relates his father's death, the distressed position of the family, and the sudden inspiration by which he, then a mere boy [Mill was then twenty], felt and made them feel that he would be everything to them—would supply the place of all that they had lost. [A case having no earthly resemblance to his own.] A vivid conception of the scene and its feelings came over me, and I was moved to tears. From this moment [!] my burden grew lighter. The oppression of the thought that all feeling was dead within me was gone. I was no longer hopeless; I was not a stock or a stone." [And then he became what he had been before.] "There was, once more, excitement, though of a moderate kind, in exerting myself for my opinions and for the public good [and 'figuring,' as before]. Thus the cloud gradually drew off, and I again enjoyed life: and [this is very significant] though I had several relapses, some of which lasted many months, I never again was as miserable as I had been" (p. 141).

Before this attack of the "blues" came on him, here were his ideas:—

"My conception of my own happiness [not that of others] was entirely identified with this object [that of being a reformer of the world, from the time he was fifteen]. The personal sympathies I wished for were those of fellow-labourers in this enterprise. . . . I was accustomed to felicitate myself on the certainty of a happy life which I enjoyed [in building castles in the air], through placing my happiness on something durable and distant, in which some progress might be always making, while it could never be exhausted by complete attainment" (p. 133). [So far

* Mill, as he left his region of recondite subjects for the sphere of every-day life, in which the most unsophisticated people feel at home, illustrated, in the "crisis of his mental history," the character of an owl in daylight, with its large head, solemn eyes, imposing garb, and judicial air. The words now given, as the essence of what he wrote, are a specimen of the owl-like wisdom which he could display on occasions.

sensible till he asked himself the foolish question, already given, when he "was in a dull state of nerves, such as everybody is occasionally liable to ".]

What has been commented on could easily have been allowed for had it been written at the time, even by a man of education, upwards of twenty years of age, but it is difficult to account for it when penned fully forty-five years afterwards. It, as well as the whole Autobiography, goes to show that Mill was very deficient in common sense, and sadly required Mrs. Taylor, or some other person, to be at his side, to keep him right in that respect. Philosophers, or some so-called philosophers at least, have often been of that character. Thus Epictetus writes:—

"Hark ye, child, it is fit you should know philosophy; but it is fit, too, you should have common sense. All this is nonsense. You learn syllogisms from philosophers; but how you are to act, you know better than they."—(*Boston Translation*, p. 66.)

This deficiency in Mill's case is well accounted for by the education he received, and which he never remedied by exertions of his own, for he said, as we have already seen:—"The education which my father gave me was in itself much more fitted for training me to *know* than to *do*" (p. 37) [or really *think*, he might have added]. "I was constantly meriting reproof by inattention, inobservance, and general slackness of mind in matters of daily life" (p. 36).

His trouble was doubtless of a nervous nature, either hereditary or personal, brought on or superinduced by the life, physical and mental, he had been leading, although he says:—

"For some years after this time [that is, some years before the attack] I wrote very little, and nothing regularly, for publication: and great were the advantages which I derived from the intermission. . . . . Had I gone on writing, it would have much disturbed the important transformation in my opinions and character, which took place during those years" [of the "crisis"] (p. 132).

It would rather have hastened it, or made it more intense. The advice of a physician, or the physical and mental habits of ordinary life, would doubtless have cured him; about which he says nothing. The case would have been an interesting one, had the real circumstances connected with it been given. He does not seem to have been annoyed by the important questions affecting the state of his soul, nor his prospects in life, for these were well secured by his official appointment; and he says nothing about his private history while dwelling under the roof of his despotic father. The isolated way in which he had been brought up, his exclusive habits afterwards, and his peculiar education and studies, were doubtless the causes of the disease manifesting itself; but the evil effects of these should have been to some extent counteracted by the exercise going to and from the India House, his short hours, and his duties there, for these were

"Sufficiently intellectual not to be distasteful drudgery, without being such as to cause any strain upon the mental powers of a person used to abstract thought, or the labour of careful literary composition" (p. 83).

In giving an account of his education, he said, as we have already seen:—"I started, I may fairly say, with an advantage of a quarter of a century over my contemporaries" (p. 31); and that "most boys or youths who have had much knowledge drilled into them [but he said that that was not the case with him] are crammed with mere facts, and with the opinions or phrases of other people, and these are accepted as a substitute for the power to form opinions of their own" (p. 31). And here is what he said of himself

in the "Crisis in his mental history," in his twenty-first year:—

"I was thus, as I said to myself, left stranded at the commencement of my voyage, with a well-equipped ship and a rudder, but no sail [or ballast]; without any real desire for the ends which I had been so carefully fitted out to work for [for which everyone was apparently to blame but himself]: no delight in virtue or the general good, but also just as little in anything else [as if he had been 'a stock or a stone']. The fountains of vanity and ambition seemed to have dried up within me, as completely as those of benevolence [for whom?]. I had had (as I reflected) some gratification of vanity at too early an age. . . . . Like all pleasures enjoyed too soon, it had made me *blasé* and indifferent to the pursuit" (p. 139). [Here we have a strange jumble of love of himself and love of his kind.]

All this was said while he was in the "blues," and it might have meant little or nothing, or been part of the "blues" themselves; still he attributes what he said to his education, which had failed to create

"Feelings in sufficient strength to resist the dissolving influence of analysis, while the whole course of my intellectual cultivation had made precocious and premature analysis the inveterate habit of my mind" (p. 138).

But he never forsook his first love —his darling analysis, for thus he wrote of it:—

"I never turned recreant to intellectual culture, or ceased to consider the power and practice of analysis, as an essential condition both of individual and of *social* [?] improvements. But I thought that it had consequences which required to be corrected, by joining other kinds of cultivation with it" (p. 143).

The crisis, however, led him to "adopt a theory of life very unlike that on which I had before acted, and having much in common with what at the time [when in his twenty-first year] I certainly had never heard of [now we have a great discovery], the anti-self-consciousness theory of Carlyle" (p. 142), that is, that happiness should not be the direct end (for then it would be selfishness); and we have a good deal of philosophizing on the point, the conclusion of which was, that this theory — which he "certainly had never heard of"— "now became the basis of my philosophy of life" (p. 143). This seems to be that happiness should not consist in contemplating an object as an end, but in using the means to reach it—a true enough principle if applied to the Creator, and to our fellow-creatures individually and collectively, that is, that we should place our happiness in the discharge of our duties to them, without regard to our own ultimate advantage or profit, or the passing pleasure or pain it may give us in using the means; although few would question the right to place our happiness in both the object and the means of attaining to it, if both are disinterested in their nature. If the happiness has no reference to the Creator or our fellow-creature, but merely to such of our own affairs as the laws of God, society, and the land approve of, or do not disapprove of, then it consists in contemplating an object and in using reasonable and virtuous means to attain it; both the object aimed at and the means of reaching it constituting the happiness, although, when the object has been secured, very little happiness is frequently found to have been gained. In short, Mill's anti-self-consciousness theory seems to be but one of the many instances of "tumbling" to be found in his Autobiography and history generally.

Mill then goes on to say that he added to his limited dry and abstract studies a number of others, such as cultivation of the feelings, and maintaining a due balance among the faculties.

"The cultivation of the feelings became one of the cardinal points in my ethical and philosophical creed. And my thoughts and inclinations turned in an increasing degree towards whatever seemed capable of being instrumental to that object" (p. 144) [such as poetry, but nothing in regard to religion].

"The only one of the imaginative arts in which I had from childhood taken great pleasure was music. . . . . But, like all my pleasurable susceptibilities, it was suspended during the gloomy period. I had sought relief again and again from this quarter, but found none. After the tide had turned, and I was in process of recovery, I had been helped forward by music, but in a much less elevated manner" (p. 144), for "I was seriously tormented by the thought of the exhaustibility of musical combinations. . . . . This source of anxiety may, perhaps, be thought to resemble that of the philosophers of Laputa, who feared lest the sun should be burnt out" (p. 145).

This cultivation of the feelings, which began at so late an age, contrasts finely with his father's ideas on the subject:—

"He regarded as an aberration of the moral standard of modern times, compared with that of the ancients, the great stress laid upon feeling. Feelings, as such, he considered to be no proper subjects of praise or blame" [whatever the occasion of their exercise] (p. 49). "My father's teachings tended to the undervaluing of feeling" (p. 110). "I needed to be made to feel that there was real permanent happiness in tranquil contemplation. Wordsworth taught me this, not only without turning away from, but with a greatly increased interest in, the common feelings and common destiny of human beings. And the delight which these poems gave me proved that, with culture of this sort [human affections], there was nothing to dread from the most confirmed habit of analysis. . . The result was that I gradually, but completely, emerged from my habitual depression, and was never again subject to it" (p. 148).

"Although we were generally in the right, as against those who were opposed to us, the effect was that the cultivation of feeling (except the feelings of public and private duties) was not in much esteem among us [the little society with *utility* for its standard in ethics and politics], and had very little place in the thoughts of most of us, myself in particular" (p. 111). "I disliked any sentiments in poetry which I should have disliked in prose; and that included a great deal. And I was wholly blind to its place in human culture, as a means of educating the feelings" (p. 112). But after the crisis "it so fell out that the merits of Wordsworth were the occasion of my public declaration of my new way of thinking, and separation from those of my habitual companions who had not undergone a similar change" (p. 149).

It is difficult to assign a reason for his separating from his friends "who had not undergone a similar change." If his state had really been that in which "converts to Methodism usually are when smitten by their first conviction of sin," leading him to "renounce the world, the flesh and the devil," it could be understood why he should have separated from his *habitual companions;* but his behaviour was incomprehensible, unless we hold that Mill, in addition to going to extremes, like the pendulum of a clock, was quarrelsome, domineering, intolerant, supercilious, or touchy in his disposition. He admitted that a schism took place between him and Roebuck, which widened from that time more and more, the chief divergence in the beginning relating to the "cultivation of the feelings," his new hobby (p. 150).

All that Mill said of the "crisis in his mental history" could have been stated in a very few words. As already mentioned, it was doubtless a nervous disorder, which (it would be absurd to deny it) could *not* have been cured by his merely "reading accidentally" a short passage in *Marmontel's Memoires*. It had the effect, however, of directing his attention to other subjects than his grinding analysis. The treatment of it should have extended to internal and external remedies, exercises, amusements, change of air, and diversified

society and reading, not omitting religion, however much that seemed to be foreign to Mill's nature; one or all being administered, as the case called for. In other words, the cultivation of a little versatility in mind and body, and a "shaking-up generally," was what he required.

IV.

HIS WIFE.

John Stuart Mill's Autobiography begins thus:—

"It seems proper that I should prefix to the following biographical sketch, some mention of the reasons which have made me think it desirable that I should leave behind me such a memorial of so uneventful a life as mine. . . . But a motive which weighs more with me than either of these, is a desire to make acknowledgment of the debts which my intellectual and moral development owes to other persons; some of them of recognized eminence, others less known than they deserve to be, and the one to whom most of all is due, one whom the world had no opportunity of knowing" (p. 2), [viz., his wife].

He says he was introduced to her in 1830, when he was in his twenty-fifth, and she in her twenty-third year (p. 184), and he was married to her after a friendship of twenty-one years. But it was "years" after his introduction to her before his "acquaintance with her became at all intimate or confidential," although he "very soon felt her to be the most admirable person he had ever known" (p. 185). He seems to have fought shy of her at first, and it is difficult to think how he could have got so far as he did, unless the nature of things was reversed by her forcing the acquaintance to a head. He told us of the solicitude of his father in keeping him from the "corrupting influence which boys exercise over boys," and the consequent "contagion of vulgar modes of thought and feeling," as well as the "demoralizing effects of school life," but nothing of the refining or seductive influences of girls or female society. There seems every reason to think that this acquaintance, from the date of its commencement in 1830, till the death of his father in 1836, or at least the influence which the lady exercised over him, was kept secret from his jealous and despotic parent; for it is hardly possible that *he* would have tolerated any one, and especially a woman, the wife of another man, to come in between him and his son in the formation of his mind. Mill's acquaintance with female society at that time must have been exceedingly limited, and it seems to have continued so till the end. Hence the adoration he lavished on Mrs. Taylor, as we have seen, making her memory his religion, and almost exhausting the English language in her praises. She seems to have been a woman of decided talent and originality, tact and accomplishments, sufficient at least to have enabled her, in many things, to turn *him* round her little finger. But we must deduct a large—indeed an extraordinarily large—discount from the draft he has drawn on posterity in favour of her capacity and divine qualities—no, not *divine* qualities, for she (like himself) apparently recognized nothing as divine. However, it is time to introduce the goddess herself. Mill says that she was

"Married at an early age to a most upright, brave, and honourable man, of liberal opinions and good education, but without the intellectual or artistic tastes which would have made him a companion for her, though a steady and affectionate friend, for whom she had true esteem, and the strongest affection through life, and whom she most deeply lamented when dead" (p. 185).

"Her intellectual gifts did but minister to a moral character at once the noblest and the best balanced which I have ever met with in life. Her unselfishness was not that of a taught system of duties [was it inspired?], but of a heart which thoroughly identified itself

with the feelings of others, and often went to excess in consideration for them by imaginatively investing their feelings with the intensity of its own. The passion of justice might have been thought to be her strongest feeling, but for her boundless generosity, and a lovingness ever ready to pour itself forth upon any or all human beings who were capable of giving the smallest feeling in return. The rest of her moral characteristics were such as naturally accompany these qualities of mind and heart: the most genuine modesty combined with the loftiest pride; a simplicity and sincerity which were absolute towards all who were fit to receive them; the utmost scorn of whatever was mean and cowardly, and a burning indignation at anything brutal or tyrannical, faithless, or dishonourable in conduct and character" (p. 187).

Why should such an exalted being—who apparently never committed a sin, and would have given away kingdoms, if she had had them—forsake a husband for whom she had the "strongest affection through life," and "most deeply lamented when dead," and, in one sense or other, "take up" with Mill for many years during the lifetime of that husband? Was it merely because he had not "the intellectual or artistic tastes which would have made him a companion for her?"

"This incomparable friend" "lived mostly with one young daughter in a quiet part of the country [in a house of her own or her husband's?], and only occasionally in town with her first husband, Mr. Taylor. I visited her equally in both places; and was greatly indebted to the strength of character which enabled her [was he the tempter?] to disregard the false [but natural] interpretations liable to be put [and that were actually put] on the frequency of my visits to her while living generally apart from Mr. Taylor [did she leave him and return to him at pleasure?], and on our occasionally travelling together [with or without the husband's consent or approval?], though in all other respects our conduct during these years gave not the slightest ground [or guarantee beyond their own assertions] for any other supposition than the true one, that our relation to each other at that time was one of strong affection and confidential intimacy only [with which the husband had no right to interfere]. For though we did not consider the ordinances of society binding on a subject so entirely personal [what does society exist for? what 'subjects' does it 'bind' but 'personal ones?'], we did feel bound that our conduct should be such as in no degree to bring discredit on her husband, nor therefore on herself" (p. 229). [But how he did that to the satisfaction of the public is not stated.]

We can easily believe that the man who wrote this, in addition to his never having had any religion, or feeling of religion, as he admitted, was equally destitute of any really moral or manly sensibility. Apart from the solemn obligations of the marriage contract and relation, the common instinct of humanity, even when found in the breast of a savage, would condemn him; for all nations have recognized the binding nature of marriage in every aspect of it, to prevent the wild disorder, even bloodshed, that would ensue from its conditions being violated even to the extent admitted. Mill said in substance that he took great care to prevent the world from forming an idea of actual criminality in the relation, but told us nothing of how he accomplished that, or how he could have convinced society that nothing criminal had resulted. If there is anything in the demands of society binding on us, it is what refers to marriage in particular, and the sexes in general; the common instinct of mankind requiring no explanations on the subject. It is wonderful how even the dumb animals respect a similar habit; the slightest infringement of it resulting in the most terrific combats. Mill's nature, notwithstanding his professions, and many of his actions, to the contrary, was apparently nothing but selfishness, as particularly illustrated by his relation with Mrs. Taylor, which seems to have been begun or carried on, with a total disregard for the

rights and feelings of her husband; and mainly that he might have her as a tutor to prompt or coach him, to make a better show before the world; which effect it did have, as he afterwards admitted. Mill was anything but candid or straightforward in his account of his relation with this lady, for, as a writer in *Fraser's Magazine*, for December, says:—

"It is but right to add that, according to the concurrent testimony of his friends, Mr. Taylor disapproved of the intimacy; that, indeed, it embittered the latter years of his life—a fact of which Mill could not have been ignorant."

And a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, for January, says:—

"From the moment he devoted himself exclusively to what he calls 'the most valuable friendship of my life,' these ties were broken. Whatever may have been their regard for Mill, these ladies found it impossible to countenance or receive a woman who had placed herself in so equivocal a position. . . . Mill, of course, took her part, and indeed was absolutely governed by her; and the consequence was a total interruption of intercourse with some of those who had been to him through life the kindest of friends. So bitter was his own feeling on the subject, that under no circumstance would he allow this intercourse to be renewed, even by letter" [as if *he* had been the greatly injured man].

This writer in the *Edinburgh Review* little more than hints at the quarrel between Mill and his friends, Mrs. Grote, Mrs. Charles Buller, and Mrs. John Austin, on Mrs. Taylor's account. It would appear that he had attempted to obtrude her acquaintance upon them, and that they naturally objected to her company under the circumstances. It is said that

"She, like all women who find themselves at war with society, and who have braved its prejudices and its laws, resented the exclusion she had drawn upon herself, the more so as it was always maintained that there was nothing criminal in her intercourse with Mill" [of which she gave the world no guarantee].

As a matter of course, Mill took her part, and in turn resented the exclusion. This was quite in keeping with his idea and theory of "liberty," propounded in his writings, that he and Mrs. Taylor, and all like them, should do or advocate pretty much what they pleased, without any one having the right to find fault with them, or decline their society, under the charge of oppression. If they had kept aloof from society, and let society come to them on their own terms, and said nothing about the matter, there would have been some reason in their action; but to attempt to break down the laws of society in so delicate and important a matter as marriage and the relation of the sexes, was to upset the very existence of society itself. Such things are to women the breath of their nostrils, and the guardians of every domestic virtue. In this matter both Mill and Mrs. Taylor showed that they were very deficient in the finer feelings of human nature, and really regarded nothing but their convenience and selfishness in their behaviour; and particularly when they advocated such anti-society doctrines in their writings. Civilization, indeed, consists mainly in renouncing the exercise of some of our natural rights in favour of society, while we find Mill claiming what nature had never given him, viz: the right to "lead about" another man's wife. This is but *one* commentary on all his boasting of what he and the lady in question did for "human improvement."

As I have already said, Mrs. Taylor seems to have been a woman of no religious belief, for, with his usual indefiniteness of language, Mill speaks of "her complete emancipation from every kind of superstition (including that which attributes a

91331

pretended perfection to the order of nature and the universe)" (p. 186). If she had any religion, she does not seem, with the influence she possessed, to have tried to bring him over to it, or to have made any impression on him. She also maintained "an earnest protest against many things which are still part of the established constitution of society" (p. 186) [not stating, as usual, what these were], which "resulted not from the hard intellect [or hard heart?] but from strength of noble and elevated feelings," that "co-existed with a highly reverential nature" (p. 186), while "making the broadest distinction between *mala in se* and mere *mala prohibita* [if not by God, by whom prohibited?]—between acts giving evidence of intrinsic badness in feeling and character [still very indefinite], and those which are only violations of conventions either good or bad; violations which, whether in themselves right or wrong, [such as?] are capable of being committed by persons in every other respect loveable or admirable" (p. 188).

This is the only allusion, indirectly made, to the feelings entertained by society regarding his connection with Mrs. Taylor, as expressed by the writers in *Fraser's Magazine* and the *Edinburgh Review*. Here we have no admission of any law by which he would be bound; no moral law of God or society (for, with his principles, he could have totally disregarded the latter); none except his interest, his vanity, or his sovereign caprice; and he dismisses the subject when he says:—

"The reader whom these things do not interest has only himself to blame if he reads farther, and I do not desire any other indulgence from him than that of bearing in mind, that for him these pages were not written" (p. 2).

"This friendship has been the honour [?] and chief blessing of my existence, as well as the source of a great part of all that I have attempted to do, or hope to effect hereafter for human improvement" (p. 184). "In thought and intellect, Shelley, so far as his powers were developed in his short life, was but a child compared with what she ultimately became" (p. 186). "She possessed in combination the qualities which, in all other persons whom I had known, I had been only too happy to find singly" (p. 186). "What I owe, even intellectually, to her, is in its detail almost infinite" (p. 189).

With his usual want of particulars, and indefiniteness of language, Mill does not state the circumstances under which she separated from her husband; nor whether she had an allowance from him to support herself and daughter, and entertain her friends. The woman who would leave her husband in the way she seems to have done would not only accept an allowance, but demand it. If she did not have that, or had no means of her own, Mill was certainly bound in honour to maintain his "Platonic love," for being his "guide, philosopher and friend," and for the great service she was to him in his literary enterprises (to say nothing of the social disgrace she incurred on his account); and if these were not remunerative, he should have fallen back on his official salary for the purpose. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," was a command which Mill did not recognize. Indeed, he said in substance that that was none of society's business. "We did not consider the ordinances of society [or any other ordinances?] binding on a subject so entirely personal" (p. 229), "whether they were good or bad, right or wrong." Nothing seems to have been thought of the poor abandoned man, for whom he "had the sincerest respect, and she the strongest affection" (p. 240). But at last there "took place the most important events of my private life" (p. 240)—the death of Mr. Taylor in July, 1849, and his marriage in April, 1851, to his widow; a "lady whose incomparable worth had made her

friendship the greatest source to me, both of happiness and improvement, [and misery to her husband?] during many years in which we never expected [while the husband lived] to be in any closer relation to one another" (p. 240). Neither seems to have had the courage, whatever might have been their inclination, to brave the law of society altogether, or the law of the land, which makes itself respected, whether people believe in the existence of God, or the law of God, or the laws of society or not.

"Ardently as I should have aspired to this complete union of our lives at any time in the course of my existence at which it had been practicable [he waited nineteen long years, and then took nearly two to make up his mind], I, as much as my wife, would far rather have foregone that privilege for ever than have owed it to the premature death of one [he was certainly in the way] for whom I had the sincerest respect, and she the strongest affection. [How considerate and disinterested they were!] That event, however, having taken place in July, 1849, it was granted to me to derive from that evil [?] my own greatest good, by adding to the partnership of thought, feeling and writing which had long existed, a partnership of our entire existence" (p. 240). [He that excuses accuses himself, as the proverb runs.] "For seven and a half years that blessing was mine; for seven and a half only! I can say nothing which could describe, even in the faintest manner, what that loss was and is" (p. 240). "Her memory is to me a religion, and her approbation the standard by which, summing up as it does all worthiness, I endeavour to regulate my life" (p. 251). [Nothing more could have been said of her had she been a divinity.]

She died at Avignon on the 3d of November, 1858, and over her grave was placed the following epitaph:—

"Her great and loving heart, her noble soul, her clear, powerful, and comprehensive intellect, made her the guide and support, the instructor in wisdom, and the example in goodness, as she was the sole earthly delight [!] of those who had the happiness to belong to her. As earnest for all public good as she was generous and devoted to all who surrounded her, her influence has been felt in many of the greatest improvements of the age, and will be in those still to come. [What were they?] Were there even a few hearts and intellects like hers, this earth would already become the hoped-for heaven."

The writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, alluded to, makes the following very just remark:—

"Of the lady herself, who is thus placed on the pinnacle of all excellence by her enthusiastic lover, we can only say that nobody else, that we have ever heard of, amongst those who knew her, discovered in her these lofty gifts."

It would have been interesting to have known what kind of epitaph her first husband would have put on her tombstone, had he survived her. So deficient does Mill seem to have been in looking at two sides—not to say all sides—of a question, and so devoid of any kind of religion, or really moral or manly sensibility, that the idea of his idol getting tired of him and casting him adrift, for some other attraction or "affinity," does not appear to have entered his imagination. Had she treated him in that way he would probably have poisoned, hanged, or in some way made away with himself, as he seems to have contemplated doing when in the "crisis of his mental history."

It is very strange that a man of Mill's education, reading, and endowments, should, at such a mature age, have put such extravagant language on record in regard to his wife, who must have been known to many besides himself. He doubtless never heard of anything like it connected with any human being; and the idea never seems to have occurred to him to ask what the world would think of it, or what is its estimate of epitaphs in general. His course indicated either the

grossest ignorance of human nature, or the fiercest defiance of its common sense and moral sentiments. It is interesting to notice what he says about this earth becoming the "hoped-for heaven;" for even atheists do not like the idea of burying a friend as one would put a favourite animal near an apple-tree.

"I bought a cottage as close as possible to the place where she is buried, and there her daughter (my fellow-sufferer and now my chief comfort) and I live constantly during a great portion of the year" (p. 251). "And though the inspirer of my best thoughts was no longer with me, I was not alone: she had left a daughter, my step-daughter, whose ever-growing and ripening talents from that day to this have been devoted to the same great purposes. Surely no one ever before was so fortunate as, after such a loss as mine, to draw another prize in the lottery of life. Whoever, either now or hereafter, may think of me and of the work I have done, must never forget that it is the product, not of one intellect and conscience, but of three" (p. 263).

So much does egotism appear to have predominated in Mill's nature, that he would blow the trumpet of himself and kith and kin surrounded by all the solemnity of death itself. There is something remarkable connected with this firm of Mill, Son & Co., which unfortunately was established by the Forfarshire ladies educating the founder of it for an utterly different purpose or calling than the one he followed. The principles of the house seem to have been well maintained by its subsequent members and ramifications; even by Mrs. Taylor's daughter, of whom nothing is said in regard to the feelings she should have had for her father when deserted by her mother; feelings that are always entertained and manifested by a girl under the circumstances. But very probably she was taken away when a mere child, and had her mind poisoned, and her sympathies perverted and drawn into the Mill connection. The house thus established seems to have chosen a horse's skeleton painted black for its sign or coat-of-arms.

We will now consider a few more of the exalted gifts of this remarkable woman, and the wonderful assistance she was to Mill in his literary career, as described in the Autobiography.

"Up to the time when I first saw her, her rich and powerful nature had chiefly unfolded itself according to the received type of feminine genius. To her outer circle she was a beauty and a wit, with an air of natural distinction, felt by all who approached her: to the inner, a woman of deep and strong feeling, of penetrating and intuitive intelligence, and of an eminently meditative and poetic nature" (p. 185). "Alike in the highest regions of speculation and in the smaller practical concerns of daily life, her mind was the same perfect instrument, piercing to the very heart and marrow of the matter; always seizing the essential idea or principle" (p. 186), with qualities that would have fitted her to be a "consummate artist," a "great orator," and "eminent among the rulers of mankind" (p. 187). "In both these departments [ultimate aims and the immediately useful and practicable] I have acquired more from her teaching than from all other sources taken together. . . . . It is not the least of my intellectual obligations to her that I have derived from her a wise scepticism which . . . . has put me on my guard against holding or announcing these conclusions [on all the subjects on which he seems to have written], with a degree of confidence which the nature of such speculations does not warrant. . . . . I have often received praise, which in my own right I only partially deserved, for the greater practicality which is supposed to be found in my writings, compared with those of most thinkers who have been equally addicted to large generalizations" (p. 189). [The praise really was due to his wife, or rather, for the most of the time, to another man's wife.]

He had the assistance, at least the friendship, of this lady for six years before he lost his father, of whom he thus writes:—

"Though acutely sensible of my own

inferiority in the qualities by which he acquired his personal ascendancy [alertness, decision and energy, among others], I had now to try what it might be possible for me to accomplish without him. . . . . Deprived of my father's aid, I was also exempted from the restraints and reticences by which that aid had been purchased" (p. 206).

At this time Mill was nearly thirty years old; old enough, one would think, to have been completely emancipated from every one. He seems to have "got along" pretty well with *two* "guides, philosophers and friends"; but after his father's death he appears to have come completely under the influence of the other, for fifteen years, when he married her, and had her all to himself for seven and a half years.

"Not only during the years of our married life, but during many of the years of confidential friendship which preceded, all my published writings were as much her work as mine; her share in them constantly increasing as years advanced" (p. 241). . . . "Over and above the general influence which her mind had over mine, the most valuable ideas and features in these joint productions—those which have been most fruitful of important results [what were these *important* results?], and have contributed most to the success and reputation of the works themselves—originated with her, were emanations from her mind, my part in them being no greater than in any of the thoughts which I found in previous writers, and made my own only by incorporating them with my own system of thought [which must have been a small ingredient in the mixture, such as a bookwright could furnish]. During the greater part of my literary life I have performed the office in relation to her, which from a rather early period I had considered as the most useful part that I was qualified to take in the domain of thought, that of an interpreter of original thinkers, and the mediator between them and the public [that is, a dry nurse to others' bantlings]; for I had always a humble opinion of my own powers as an original thinker, except in abstract science" (p. 242). "My own strength lay wholly in the uncertain and slippery intermediate region, that of theory or moral and political science" (p. 189) [which should have kept him from rushing into almost every *practical* subject connected with life]. "It will easily be believed [there is no doubt about it] that when I came into close intellectual communion with a person of the most eminent faculties, whose genius, as it grew and unfolded itself in thought, continually struck out truths far in advance of me, but in which I could not, as I had done in those others [the Coleridgians, the German thinkers, and Carlyle], detect any mixture of error [was he a fallible and she an infallible being?], the greatest part of my mental growth consisted in the assimilation of those truths [what were they?]; and the most valuable part of my intellectual work was in building the bridges and clearing the paths [mechanical work] which connected them with my general system of thought" (p. 243) [whether his own or borrowed from others].

Of his *Principles of Political Economy*, the most important chapter, on the "Probable future of the labouring classes," was entirely due to her:—

"It was chiefly her influence that gave to the book that general tone by which it is distinguished from all previous expositions of Political Economy that had any pretension to being scientific" (p. 246). "This example illustrates well the general character of what she contributed to my writings. What was abstract and purely scientific was generally mine [sometimes his own 'cogitations,' and sometimes those of others]; the proper human element [or common sense] came from her: in all that concerned the application of philosophy to the exigencies of human society and progress, I was her pupil" (p. 247). "Her practical turn of mind, and her almost unerring estimate of practical obstacles, repressed in me all tendencies that were really visionary" (p. 248).

He says of his *System of Logic*, that it "owed little to her except in the minuter matters of composition, in which respect my writings, both great and small, have largely benefited by her accurate and clear-sighted criticism" (p. 244). But if

he received no other *direct* assistance from her in this work, he had it from Mr. Bain, who "went carefully through the manuscript before it was sent to press, and enriched it with a great number of additional examples and illustrations from science; many of which, as well as some detached remarks of his own in confirmation of my logical views, I inserted nearly in his own words" (p. 245); and a good deal of a slightly different nature from Comte. In writing the *Logic* he said that he was 'stopped and brought to a halt on the threshold of Induction" (p. 207), but the history of Dr. Whewell on the *Inductive Sciences*, gave him what he "had been waiting for" (pp. 208 and 223); and he "gained much from Comte" (p. 210).* Of his *Liberty* he says:—

"None of my writings have been either so carefully composed or so sedulously corrected as this" (p. 205). It "was more directly and literally our joint production than anything else which bears my name" (p. 251). "With regard to the thoughts, it is difficult to identify any particular part or element as being more hers than all the rest. The whole mode of thinking of which the book was the expression was emphatically hers. But [oddly as it may appear] I also was so thoroughly imbued with it, that the same thoughts naturally occurred to us both. That I was thus penetrated with it, however, I owe in a great degree to her. . . . . She benefited me as much by keeping me right when I was right, as by leading me to new truths, and ridding me of errors" (p. 252). "Its final revision was to have been a work of the winter, 1858-9" (p. 250). [But losing her before that, he printed it as it stood.]

Part of his *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* had also "been approved and revised by her" (p. 257). The remainder of it "I had never discussed with my almost infallible counsellor [!], and I had no evidence that she would have concurred in it" (p. 257). Of his *Dissertations and Discussions*, he says:—

"The selection had been made during my wife's lifetime, but the revision, in concert with her, with a view to publication, had been barely commenced; and when I had no longer the guidance of her judgment, I despaired of pursuing it further [did he generally swim with bladders round his neck?] and republished the papers as they were, with the exception of striking out such passages as were no longer in accordance with my opinions" (p. 261).

Of his *Subjection of Women*, he says:—"As ultimately published, ... all that is most striking and profound belongs to my wife" (p. 266).

"The steps in my mental growth for which I was indebted to her were far from being those which a person wholly uninformed on the subject would probably suspect. It may be supposed, for instance, that my strong convictions on the complete equality in all legal, political, social and domestic relations, which ought to exist between men and women [voting, holding office, fighting, supporting themselves, with no claims on their husbands, or they on them, etc.?] may have been adopted or learned from her. This was so far from being the fact, that these convictions were among the earliest results of the application of my mind [doubtless with the assistance of his father or some other person] to political subjects, and the strength with which I held them was, I believe, more than anything else, the originating cause of the interest she felt in me. What is true is, that until I knew her, the opinion was in my mind little more than an abstract principle [as usual]. . . . . But that perception of the vast practical bearings of women's disabilities [?] which found expression in the book on the *Subjection of Women* was acquired

* Of his edition of his father's work on the *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind*, he says:—"This was a joint undertaking: the psychological notes being furnished in about equal proportions by Mr. Bain and myself, while Mr. Grote supplied some valuable contributions on points in the history of philosophy incidentally raised; and Dr. Andrew Findlater supplied the deficiencies in the book which had been occasioned by the imperfect philological knowledge of the time when it was written" (p. 308).

mainly through her teaching. . . . . I am indeed painfully conscious of how much of her best thoughts on the subject I have failed to reproduce, and how greatly that little treatise falls short of what [it] would have been if she had put on paper her entire mind on this question, or had lived to revise and improve, as she certainly would have done, my imperfect statement of the case" [p. 244].

His *Utilitarianism*, with the exception of some additional matter, was "written during the last years of his married life" (p. 266), and doubtless was as much his wife's as the others.

It would have been interesting if Mill had told us fully where a "being of these qualities" (p. 188) could have got all her information, since "to be admitted into any degree of mental intercourse" with her "could not but have a most beneficial influence on his development" (p. 188).

"To her who had at first reached her opinions by the moral intuition of a character of strong feeling [was that inspiration?] there was doubtless help as well as encouragement to be derived from one who had arrived at many of the same results by study and reasoning: and in the rapidity of her intellectual growth, her mental activity, which converted everything into knowledge, doubtless drew from me [there she must have bamboozled him], as it did from other sources, many of its materials" (p. 188).

That was a subject upon which Mill appears to have remained ignorant to the last, and it may become one of discussion to such as feel interested in it.

V.

MILL AND SON.

It is remarkable that Mill, depending so much upon others, directly and indirectly, for his opinions, and the details, as well as some of the execution, of so many of the writings published in his name, should have looked upon himself as an Apostle: for he says:—

"A person of high intellect should never go into unintellectual society unless he can enter it as an Apostle; yet he is the only person with high objects who can safely enter it at all" (p. 228).

The only real apostleship which characterized him was that of rank atheism, acquired at second hand, and preached by his executors; which "society" of any kind can well dispense with. The writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, alluded to, says:—

"What education would he have given them? What has he ever done to promote their education in any one respect which would make the peasant and the artizan a better and a happier man?" "In truth, if the whole work of his life be examined, it will be found to be eminently destructive, but not to contain one practical constructive idea."

And the writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* says:—

"There was not an opinion or an institution cherished by his countrymen which he . . . . did not attack, with a view to its absolute extinction." "Marriage was the institution which he especially assailed," "and called upon the whole female sex to revolt against it, as unworthy and to the lowest degree degrading."

As illustrative of the mischief-making intentions or tendencies of his nature and teaching, like those of a child starting machinery which it could not control, the following may be given, when he says that he

"Earnestly hoped that Owenite, St. Simonian, and all other anti-property doctrines might spread widely among the poorer classes; not that I thought those doctrines true, or desired that they should be acted on, but in order that the higher classes might be made to see that they had more to fear from the poor when uneducated than when educated" (p. 172).

His father's words would apply, in an eminent degree, to himself, not

only in the matter of religion, but in many other things, when he wrote:—

"He disliked people quite as much for any other deficiency, provided he thought it equally likely to make them act ill. He disliked, for instance, a fanatic in any bad cause, as much or more than one who adopted the same cause from self-interest, because he thought him even more likely to be practically mischievous" (p. 50).

Mill was to a very great extent, and in a very marked degree, a "made or manufactured man, having had a certain impress of opinions stamped on him which he could only reproduce" (p. 155), notwithstanding what he says about his ideas of Wordsworth and Byron, whether the impress was made on him by his father, Mrs. Taylor, or whoever they were that "attached him to their cars."

"I felt that what my father had said respecting my peculiar advantages was exactly the truth and common sense of the matter, and it fixed my opinion and feeling from that time forward" (p. 35), [viz:] "that it was no matter of praise to me if I knew more than those who had not had a similar advantage, but the deepest disgrace to me if I did not" (p. 34).

His case was not that of a boy brought up and educated in the ordinary way, and depending on no one but himself, or one brought up in circumstances of destitution, and deprived of every advantage of even the most elementary instruction, and yet who educated himself and rose to distinction; but one who was educated and trained as a stalled ox is fed. He was a forced, hot-house plant, that had everything done for it, and "crammed with mere facts, and with the opinions or phrases of other people" (p. 31), which his training enabled him to manipulate and transpose this way and that way, as a person acquires a trade, business or art, on being put to it; some showing greater merits in proportion to their application, and natural talents running in that way. This is what Mill was substantially, leaving it as an open question his estimate of himself when he said:—"My own strength lay wholly in the uncertain and slippery intermediate region, that of theory or moral and political science" (p. 189).

A person appearing before the world advocating an idea or a fact that may have incidentally presented itself to him, and taking up others that the first may have as incidentally led to, is a kind of person totally different from one like Mill, whose "cramming" urged him to become a "reformer of the world" at the time he was fifteen, when he had no practical knowledge of the world (and never really acquired it), or of what there was in it that required reformation. The latter is almost sure to become, in some things at least, little better than a demagogue, or pest generally, especially when his capacity or training qualifies him, for the most part, to but level and fire off the guns of others' loading.

Mill's premature studies really spoiled him, for they were not counteracted, modified, or controlled by subsequent practical knowledge. They led him, at the early age mentioned, to say that

"The most transcendent glory I was capable of conceiving was that of figuring, successful or unsuccessful, as a Girondist in an English convention" (p. 63). An idea doubtless imbibed from his father. And when he was a young man he said:—"The French *philosophes* of the eighteenth century were the example we sought to imitate, and we hoped to accomplish no less results [!]. No one of the set went to so great excesses in this boyish ambition as I did (p. 108). . . . Ambition and desire of distinction I had in abundance; and zeal for what I thought the good of mankind was my strongest sentiment, mixing with and colouring all others. But my zeal was as yet little else, at that

period of my life [and at no other period], than zeal for speculative opinions" (p. 109).

As we have seen, his capacity, as he admitted, never went further, at any time, than to entertain speculative opinions and theories. It led him, when in his twenty-first year, to give expression to crude ideas about his "love of mankind and of excellence for its own sake" (p. 135), when he did not love *anyone* sufficiently to justify him in confiding in him the particulars of a nervous disorder with which he was afflicted. And still he clung to his ideal:—

"For though my dejection, honestly looked at, could not be called other than egotistical, produced by the ruin, as I thought, of my fabric of happiness, yet the destiny of mankind in general [in this world only] was ever in my thoughts, and could not be separated from my own. I felt that the flaw in my life must be a flaw in life itself" [!] (p. 145).

Mill never had a real boyhood, and apparently for that reason retained, in a great measure, the character of a "raw lad" to the last, as his Autobiography to a great extent shows, in many ways, and especially in the high-flown language which he uses in panegyrizing any and every one connected or associated with himself. His opinions, and the language in which they are expressed, are generally so extreme that they merit very little notice or credit. As illustrative of his raw-lad-like peculiarities, we may collect from the Autobiography the following expressions, in addition to those set down at page 81:—

Cardinal points.
Fundamental constitution of modes of thought.
Fundamental improvement.
Great purposes.
High intellect.
High objects.
Higher principles.
Intellectual creed.
Intellectual cultivation.
Intellectual growth.
Mental changes.
Mental development.
Mental history.
Mental progress.
Mental superiority.
Mental work.
Radical amendment.
Self-improvement.
Thinking faculties.
Ultimate aims.

There is much in the Autobiography in relation to himself, his wife and his father, that need not have been made public, as Mill has done it. In regard to his father, he committed a worse than Ham-like action, for Ham was cursed for not immediately covering his father's nakedness, while Mill exposed his parent's, such as it was, to the gaze of all mankind. Indeed, Mill seems to have been very deficient, not only in common sense, as I have already said, but in delicacy or manliness of feeling, having little or no regard for the ordinary proprieties, or the sensibilities of others, were it only those of his followers, who cannot look on his Autobiography but with a sense of mortification, however interesting it may be to others, as the history of what might be called an irregularity in nature; but not possessing a single quality to justify its being put into the hands of youth, notwithstanding all its professions and fine phrases to that end. There is another point that Mill should have considered in his lifetime, that it is the custom, indeed the law, that no government officer is allowed to express, far less publish, opinions for or against the law or government of the country, past or present; and although he was not directly employed by the Crown, he stood somewhat in the same position, and should have governed himself accordingly. But it appears to have been no part of Mill's nature to entertain points of delicacy or etiquette of that kind.

It may interest the reader to know how Mill the elder, whose coat-of-

arms seems to have been "a horse's skeleton painted black," and whose "portion" was "this world," went out of it.

"During the whole of 1835 his health had been declining: his symptoms became unequivocally those of pulmonary consumption, and after lingering to the last stage of debility, he died on the 23d of June, 1836. Until the last few days of his life, there was no apparent abatement of intellectual vigour; his interest in all things and persons that had interested him through life was undiminished; nor did the approach of death cause the smallest wavering (as in so strong and firm a mind it was impossible that it should) in his convictions on the subject of religion [as to its being 'a great moral evil']. His principal satisfaction, after he knew that his end was near, seemed to be the thought of what he had done to make the world better than he found it [did he do that?]; and his chief regret in not living longer, that he had not time to do more" (p. 203).

The following are some of his opinions, in addition to those already given:—

"He thought human life a poor thing at best [as it is, if its end is no better than a dog's], after the freshness of youth and of unsatisfied [satisfied?] curiosity had gone by. This was a topic on which he [naturally enough] did not often speak, especially, it may be supposed, in the presence of young persons; but when he did, it was with an air of settled and profound conviction. He would sometimes say that if life were made what it might be, by good government and good education [such as he gave to his son, which excluded everything connected with the imagination and the heart], it would be worth having; but he never spoke with anything like enthusiasm even of that possibility" (p. 48).

"My father never was a great admirer of Shakspeare, the English idolatry of whom he used to attack with some severity" (p. 16).

"For a long time I saw nothing in these [early articles of Carlyle] (as my father saw nothing in them to the last) but insane rhapsody" (p. 161). "I did not, however, deem myself a competent judge of Carlyle. I felt that he was a poet, and that I was not; that he was a man of intuition, which I was not [and there he spoke the truth, for he acquired his knowledge as a sponge takes in water]; and that as such he not only saw many things long before me, which I could only, when they were pointed out to me, hobble after [like an impotent man] and prove, but that it was highly probable he could see many things which were not visible to me even after they were pointed out. [He must have been dull in the apprehension.] I knew that I could not see round him, and could never be certain that I saw over him; and I never presumed to judge him with any definiteness until he was interpreted to me by [his 'almost infallible counsellor'] one greatly the superior of us both—who was more a poet than he, and more a thinker than I—whose own mind and nature included his, and infinitely more" (p. 176). [The nymph appearing to Numa at the fountain was nothing compared with her.]

In considering what Mill further says of his father, we must make great allowance for the peculiarity of his nature, and his general want of judgment, especially when displayed in bragging, however indirectly, about himself, or directly in regard to any one connected with himself, or indeed, any person whatever.

"His place is an eminent one in the literary and even in the political history of his country; and it is far from honourable to the generation which has benefited by his work [?] that he is so seldom mentioned, and, compared with men far his inferiors, so little remembered" (p. 203). "He did not revolutionize, or rather create, one of the great departments of thought. But . . . he will be known to posterity as one of the greatest names in that most important branch of speculation on which all the moral [?] and political sciences ultimately rest. . . . . As Brutus was called the last of the Romans, so was he the last of the eighteenth century" (p. 204). "By his writings and his personal influence he was a great centre of light to his generation" (p. 205).

In a letter which James Mill addressed to Jeremy Bentham, in the year 1814, he says:—

"In reflecting upon the duty which we owe to our principles—to that system of important truths of which you have the immortal honour to be the author, but of which I am a most faithful and fervent disciple [or one of his brood], and hitherto, I have fancied, my master's favourite disciple [as if he were addressing the prophet Jeremiah] —I have considered that there was nobody at all so likely to be your real successor as myself. Of talents it would be easy to find many superior. But, in the first place, I hardly know of anybody who has so completely taken up the principles, and is so thoroughly of the same way of thinking with yourself. In the next place, there are very few who have so much of the necessary previous discipline; my antecedent years having been wholly occupied in acquiring it. And, in the last place, I am pretty sure you cannot think of any other person whose whole life will be devoted to the propagation of the system" (*Bourne*). [He seems to have prayed most earnestly for Jeremy to throw his mantle over him.]

Of this "grand system of truths," which was to have established the millennium on earth, the writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, alluded to, says:—

"Indeed, so far was Benthamism from founding a school, that it perished with its first disciples; no such being as a Benthamite of the second generation is known to exist, and even the survivors of the original sect no longer belong to it. Yet these were the men who had started in life with a theory [an utterly godless one] which was to rally to it all educated minds, and regenerate the world. Fifty years have passed, and where is their theory now? It did not last them half their own lives. John Mill himself had slipped out of the pale. The elder Mill remained steadfast in unbelief, denouncing with savage vehemence the deserters from his standard" [and died as he had lived].

The remaining remarks which I shall give from Mill in regard to his father must be received not merely with "a grain of salt," but with a large allowance, or "a heavy discount off the face of them," for obvious reasons, till at least they can be confirmed by disinterested people more capable than himself, and having the opportunity of putting a correct estimate on his parent's merits, and particularly in connection with India.

"It is only one of his minor merits that he was the originator of all sound statesmanship in regard to the subject of his largest work, India" (p. 205). "In his History he had set forth, for the first time, many of the true principles of Indian administration; and his despatches, following his History [which was published in the beginning of 1818], did more than had ever been done before to promote the improvement of India, and teach Indian officials to understand their business. [This, comparatively speaking, humble subordinate would seem to have 'run' the company.] If a selection of them were published, they would, I am convinced [whatever other people might think], place his character as a practical statesman [the Governor, directors, etc., having had apparently nothing to do with the despatches] fully on a level [whatever that was] with his eminence as a speculative writer" (p. 26).

"He wrote on no subject which he did not enrich with valuable thought [religion, for example]. . . . . In the power of influencing by mere force of mind and character, the convictions and purposes of others [he could not keep Bentham's goats together], and in the strenuous exertion of that power to promote freedom and progress, he left, as [far as] my knowledge extends [a safe reservation], no equal among men, and but one among women" (p. 205), [who must be incensed or fumigated on all occasions].

Among the odd doctrines held by him, the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* says that he maintained that "all men are born with equal faculties, and that their mental power or weakness [what about the physical?] is the mere result of education and circumstances." And his son got very little in advance of him in that respect, when he gave it as his opinion that his receiving the intellectual cramming given

him "could assuredly be done by any boy or girl of average capacity and healthy physical constitution" (p 30). Mill says of his father:—

"Nor did he think it possible to set any positive bounds to the moral capabilities which might unfold themselves in mankind under an enlightened direction of social and educational influences" (p. 179), [provided that the worship of God, or even the belief in his existence, or religion in any shape, be banished from the world.]

But that is in direct contradiction to what he said, as we have just seen:—"He would sometimes say that if life were made what it might be, by good government [the English was certainly a good government] and good education, it would be worth having; *but he never spoke with anything like enthusiasm even of that possibility*" (p. 48). He must have been difficult to please with both government and education. John Stuart Mill gives it as his own opinion that "education, habit and the cultivation of the sentiments, will make a common man [why a *common* man?] dig or weave for his country as readily as fight for his country" (p. 232). His "country" has always paid, and always expects to pay, for these, as well as all other services.

John Stuart Mill seems to have "boxed the compass" on almost all the subjects he touched: but he never did it on religion, for he never had one to change. He appears to have kept or lost the count of his changes; at least, he speaks of "the third *period* of his mental progress," but does not mention the changes during each of these periods. The following is a list of some of them, arranged alphabetically:—

Actual revolution.
Further mental changes.
Future development.
Last change.
New era in my life.
New fabric of thought.
New way of thinking.
Third period of my mental progress.
Transformation in my opinions.
Transition in my mode of thought.

He was capable of working a good deal of mischief during his lifetime, with people lacking the capacity or knowledge to reject his nostrums, and partly because of the half-mythical kind of mystery surrounding him, and the uncertainty regarding his religious opinions. In the Autobiography such people will not find a sound moral or manly sentiment of any importance; but much to create a disgust for the father, and a pity for the son for being subjected to the training he received; as well as anything but a respect for the want of judgment and natural feeling displayed throughout it. It is unnecessary to speak of his radicalism, democracy, women's-rights-ism, socialism, St. Simonism, Owenism, or demagogism generally. But all, or almost all, of his peculiarities could have been forgiven him, had he not, after seeing nearly the three-score and ten, and receiving many public honours, stated in his posthumous writings that he never had any religion, or apparently a feeling of it, or belief in the existence of God, and glorying in the same; thus putting himself, in that respect, on a level with the brutes that perish.

His writings must stand on their merits and the circumstances under which they were produced; and so must the personal and conventional virtues and peculiarities by which he may have been characterized. His Autobiography shows a wonderful egotism as regards himself and all connected with him—all apparently practical atheists; an egotism which nothing would seem to have been capable of affecting, except perhaps to anger him for the moment; for in other respects we could imagine it to have been insensible to a hint and indifferent to a rebuke. When writing it, he may have imagined, in his ignorance of

human nature, that he was presenting himself as an object of admiration to the world, notwithstanding that he said, "I do not for a moment imagine that any part of what I have to relate can be interesting to the public as a narrative, or as being connected with myself" (p.1); his only reasons being that the cause of education, and the improvement of the mind, might be advanced by his own history, and especially that acknowledgement should be made of the debt he owed to his wife, *who predeceased him*, for his intellectual and moral development! It can safely be said that Pan never would have had a temple, priests and worshippers, had be hobnobbed with every one, and been brought home every night on a barrow or stretcher.

SIMSON'S HISTORY OF THE GIPSIES.*

"WE cannot but think that the last few years have wrought sad havoc with these queer wanderers; for a long time they stoutly withstood the inroads of civilization, but now, like many other romantic nuisances, they are being improved off the face of the earth. . . . . We can hardly sympathise with the sorrow Mr. Simson would doubtless have felt, had he been alive, at their extinction." †

I confess I felt surprised on reading the above in *Land and Water* of the 19th July, in the face of the author showing that the Gipsies had only changed their style of life, from an out-door to a settled condition, and were following a variety of callings common to the ordinary natives of the country. In my addition to the work I showed, fully and elaborately, how the tribe exist, and perpetuate their existence, in a mixed, settled, and more or less civilized state; and that "so prolific has the race been that there cannot be less than 250,000 Gipsies of all castes, colours, characters, occupations, degrees of education, culture, and position in life, in the British Isles alone, and possibly double that number." The subject of the Gipsies stands thus on an entirely different footing from what has hitherto been believed of it. The idea is novel, but why should anything, merely because it is novel, be tacitly or actually proscribed; to say nothing of those amenities and courtesies that are supposed to be observed in the republic of letters, and particularly between those of the two continents? If such a course had been followed in other matters, and the impression of society, however ill-founded, had been the only test of

---

* New York: James Miller.

† In a comparatively late number of *Chambers' Journal* is the following:—"As the wild-cat, the otter and the wolf generally disappear before the advance of civilization, the wild races of mankind are, in like manner and degree, gradually coming to an end, and from the same causes [!]. The waste lands get enclosed, the woods are cut down, the police becomes yearly more efficient, and the Pariahs vanish with their means of subsistence. [Cannot they find 'means of subsistence' away from the waste lands and the woods?] In England there are at most 1,500 Gipsies. Before the end of the present century they will probably be extinct over Western Europe." [!]

The *Athenæum*, on the 3d December, 1870, says:—"The rest of this people, who are scattered over Europe, and who are disappearing gradually with the increase of the civilization that surrounds them." And the *Saturday Review*, on the 29th November, 1873, writes:—"In this country the gradual enclosure of commons and waste lands, with other discouragements to vagabond life, can hardly fail ere long to extinguish the race."

truth, where would humanity have been to-day? Knowledge would never have progressed, and we would have been in a condition little better than that of semi-barbarism. What reason could any one advance in favour of the Gipsies "ceasing to be Gipsies" by disappearing from the roads, woods, and fields? And how could he maintain that position as a matter of fact? Look at a tent of such of the Gipsies as still go about, when all the family are together, and see how prolific they are, and consider that it has been so from at least the time of Henry VIII. How could any one say that the progeny and descendants of this people had no more affinity with the tribe, or even knowledge of it, than the company that played the part on the stage the night before?

The true position of the Gipsies is described as follows:—"Here we have ethnology on its legs—a wild Oriental race dropt into the midst of all the nations of Europe, and legally and socially proscribed by them, yet drawing into their body much of the blood of other people and incorporating it with their own, and assimilating to the manners of the countries in which they live; sometimes threading their way by marriage through native families, and maintaining their identity, in a more or less mixed state, in the world, notwithstanding their having no religion peculiar to themselves, like the Jews." In the Gipsies we have a race, mixed as it is, that is distinct from any other, having blood, language or words, a cast of mind, signs, and a sort of masonic society extending over the world—all of comparatively recent appearance in Europe—which hold them together in feeling and, to a certain extent, association, in the face of the popular prejudice against the name, which none of them will acknowledge, after leaving the tent for "tramping" or any calling in settled society. There is in this subject, when fully explained, much to interest a variety of societies, classes of people, and kinds of readers; who cannot say when investigating it that they do not find facts and arguments to demonstrate what is set forth, for the work contains a superabundance of such. In approaching the subject, however, it is necessary that people should divest themselves of preconceived ideas, and advance in it as far as the facts will lead them. They should likewise show that moral and social courage, in the face of public opinion, that is so necessary towards acknowledging the tribe, and extending to it the respect that is shown to similar classes of the ordinary natives, whatever the origin of the former, and their sympathies with the tribe at home or scattered over the world.*

* Dated August 20th, 1873.

MR. BORROW ON THE GIPSIES.

THE first thought which a physician should have is for his patient, a lawyer for his client, and an author for his subject, in all its aspects, whether good, bad, or indifferent—each leaving himself out of consideration. It cannot be said that Mr. Borrow has obeyed this law in regard to the Gipsies, for, as far as my memory serves me, he has neglected to comment on, admit, or reject the facts and opinions of his

case as discovered and advanced by others, assuming that he ever examined them; and has put forth his own ideas only, as if nothing had been said by others before or besides him, and given inconsiderate and vague suppositions for realities, and unfounded and illogical assertions for carefully-considered inductive reasonings.

The *History of the Gipsies, with Specimens of the Gipsy Language*, by Walter Simson, with Preface, Introduction and Notes, and a Disquisition on the past, present, and future of the race, by myself, published towards the end of 1865, contained, in my opinion, an ample refutation of much that Mr. Borrow had advanced; but I did not expect him to make any reply to it, and far less admit what was advanced and, I may say, proved. The book just published by him, under the title of *Romano Lavo-Lil*, has fully justified my conclusion; for he has completely ignored all that was said, and will apparently do so for the future, if the world will allow him to do it. As an author, he is evidently a very self-willed, opinionative, and capricious gentleman, that is full of hard, hide-bound dogmatisms that are difficult of being driven out of him, whatever the means that may be resorted to for that purpose.

As the *History of the Gipsies* has apparently been little noticed, and I dare say as little read (although doubtless seen by Mr. Borrow), I will give some extracts from it, bearing on him, with regard to the most important parts of what he has written on the subject. These, however, are only a part of what has been said in regard to him; and for the remainder the reader is referred to his name in the index to the book itself. What is contained in these extracts will be all the more satisfactory on account of it not having been got up for the present occasion, but confirmed by nine years' reflection since the history appeared; while it applies to much that is contained in the work just published.*

It strikes me as something very singular that Mr. Borrow, "whose acquaintance with the Gipsy race, in general, dates from a very early period of his life;" who "has lived more with Gipsies than Scotchmen;" and than whom "no one ever enjoyed better opportunities for a close scrutiny of their ways and habits," should have told us so little about the Gipsies. In all his writings on the Gipsies, he alludes to two mixed Gipsies only—the Spanish half-pay captain, and the English flaming tinman—in a way as if these were the merest of accidents, and meant nothing. He has told us nothing of the Gipsies but what was known before, with the exception, as far as my memory serves me, of the custom of the Spanish Gipsy dressing her daughter in such a way as to protect her virginity; the existence of the tribe, in a civilized state, in Moscow; and the habit of the members of the race possessing two names; all of which are, doubtless, interesting pieces of information. In Mr. Borrow's writings upon the Gipsies, we find only sketches of certain individuals of the race, whom he seems to have fallen in with, and not a proper account of the nation. These writings have done more injury to the tribe than, perhaps, anything that ever appeared on the subject. I have met with Gipsies—respectable young men—who complained bitterly of Mr. Borrow's account of their race; and they did that with good reason; for his attempt at generalization on the subject of the people is as great a curiosity as ever I set my eyes upon. How unsatisfactory are Mr. Borrow's opinions on the Gipsy question, when he speaks of the "decadence" of the race, when it is only passing from its first stage of

* When the extracts are from my contribution to the work, they will be so marked; the others are from the history proper. I make no apology for the length of the extracts given in this article, for the reason that a meal is more acceptable than a tantalizing mouthful. What I have said of a naturalist applies equally well to this subject, that one "cannot be too full and circumstantial, exact and logical in his information, to make it of any use in settling a question like the one under consideration" (p. 36.)

existence—the tent. This he does in his Appendix to the *Romany Rye;* and it is nearly all that can be drawn from his writings on the Gipsies, in regard to their future history (Ed., p. 523).

We have already seen how a writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* gravely asserts, that, although "Billy Marshall left descendants numberless, the race, of which he was one, was in danger of becoming extinct;" when, in fact, it had only passed from its first stage of existence—the tent, into its second—tramping, without the tent; and after that, into its ultimate stage—a settled life. We have likewise seen how Sir Walter Scott imagines that the Scottish Gipsies have decreased, since the time of Fletcher, of Saltoun, about the year 1680, from 100,000 to 500, by "the progress of time, and increase in the means of life, and the power of the laws." Mr. Borrow has not gone one step ahead of these writers; and, although I naturally enough excuse them, I am not inclined to let him go scot-free, since he has set himself forward so prominently as an authority on the Gipsy question (Ed., p. 447). It would be a treat to have a treatise from Mr. Borrow upon the Gipsy race "dying out" by "changing its habits," or by the acts of any government, or by ideas of "gentility" (Ed., p. 450).

If there is little reason for thinking that the Gipsies left India owing to the cruelties of Timour, there is less for supposing, as Mr. Borrow supposes, that their being called Egyptians originated, not with themselves, but with others; for he says that the tale of their being Egyptians "probably originated amongst the priests and learned men of the East of Europe, who, startled by the sudden apparition of bands of people foreign in appearance and language, skilled in divination and the occult arts, endeavoured to find in Scripture a clue to such a phenomenon; the result of which was that the Romas (Gipsies) of Hindostan were suddenly transformed into Egyptian penitents, a title which they have ever since borne in various parts of Europe." Why should the priests and learned men of the East of Europe go to the Bible to find the origin of such a people as the Gipsies? What did priests and learned men know of the Bible at the beginning of the fifteenth century? Did every priest, at that time, know there even was such a book as the Bible in existence? The priests and learned men of the East of Europe were more likely to turn to the Eastern nations for the origin of the Gipsies, than to Egypt, were the mere matter of the skill of the Gipsies in divination and the occult arts to lead them to make any inquiry into their history. When the Gipsies entered Europe, they would feel under the necessity of saying who they were. Having committed themselves to that point, how could they afterwards call themselves by that name which Mr. Borrow supposes the priests and learned men to have given them? Or, I should rather say, how could the priests and learned men think of giving them a name after they themselves had said who they were? And did the priests and learned men invent the idea of the Gipsies being pilgrims, or bestow upon their leaders the titles of dukes, earls, lords, counts and knights of Little Egypt? Assuredly not; all these matters must have originated with the Gipsies themselves. The truth is, Mr. Borrow has evidently had no opportunities of learning, or at least has not duly appreciated, the real mental acquirements of the early Gipsies; an idea of which will be found in the history of the race on their first general arrival in Scotland, about a hundred years after they were first taken notice of in Europe, during which time they are not supposed to have made any great progress in mental condition. What evidently leads Mr. Borrow and others astray in the matter of the origin of the Gipsies, is, that they conclude that, because the language spoken by the Gipsies is apparently, or for the most part, Hindostanee, therefore the people speaking it originated in Hindostan; as just a conclusion as it would be to maintain that the Negroes in Liberia originated in England because they speak the English language! (Ed., p. 39).

Mr. Borrow gives a very interesting and, on the face of it, reliable account of a visit he paid to Yetholm, to "interview" the Queen of the Scottish Gipsies. The first woman he accosted denied the impeachment that *she* was a Gipsy, by saying, "Na, na, sir! I am the bairn of decent parents, and be-

long not to Kirk Yetholm, but to Haddington" (p. 308). She, however, gave him this sage counsel:—

"I wish to caution you when you get to the speech of the queen, not to put any speerings to her about a certain tongue or dialect which they say the Gipsies have. All the Gipsies become glum and dour as soon as they are spoken to about their language, and particularly the queen. The queen might say something uncivil to your honour, should you ask her questions about her language" (p. 311).

The next woman, with blue eyes, "who had had her eye on his honour for some time past," was related to the queen, and as indignantly denied the impeachment that she was *not* a Gipsy. She conducted him to her majesty, who said, "I am a Gipsy, and a real one; I am not ashamed of my blood" (p. 315). As usual with the race, she denied all knowledge of the language, till she was nettled into admitting it. After finding that it was "safe to talk to him on Gipsy matters," she was willing to do it as long as he liked, and added:—

"I am now ready to talk to you as much as you please about *Nokkum* words and matters, for I see there is no danger. But I tell you frankly that had I not found that you knew as much as, or a great deal more than, myself, not a hundred pounds, nor indeed all the money in Berwick, should have induced me to hold discourse with you about the words and matters of the Brown Children of Kirk Yetholm" (p. 318).

Mr. Borrow then goes on to say:—

"I soon found that her knowledge of Romany was anything but extensive; far less so, indeed, than that of the commonest English Gipsy woman. . . . . I should say that the sum total of her vocabulary barely amounted to three hundred words [a very unreliable estimate, after a short, or comparatively short, interview, for we are not told how long it lasted]. Even of these there were several which were not pure Gipsy words; that is, belonging to the speech which the ancient Zingary brought with them to Britain. Some of her bastard Gipsy words belonged to the cant or allegorical jargon of thieves" (p. 319). "After all, her knowledge of gentle Romany was not altogether to be sneezed at" (p. 322). "She said that . . . . slight as I might consider her knowledge of Romany to be, it was far greater than that of any other Gipsy on the Border, or indeed in the whole of Scotland; and that, as for the *Nokkums*, there was not one on the Green who was acquainted with half-a-dozen words of Romany [all these assertions would require to be proved], though the few words they had [doubtless, more than five, although she said that not one of them had six] they prized high enough, and would rather part with their hearts' blood than communicate them to a stranger" * (p. 321).

---

* Of the Gipsy language at Yetholm, Mr. Baird, the minister of the parish, wrote, in 1840, thus:—

"It farther appears from these specimens of words and expressions used by the Yetholm Gipsies, that they have by no means a complete language, but that they are in the habit of connecting their own words by the pronouns and other smaller words of our language. . . . It is a secret with them; all of them will at first positively and repeatedly deny that they have any language peculiar to themselves. It was only by some management that I obtained from them the list I have now given. The children, however, are known to speak it when they imagine no one overhears them. Their parents carefully instruct them in this branch of knowledge. The grown-up Gipsies also, when they are a little off their guard—on the occasion of any of their merry-meetings, for instance—frequently converse, in the hearing of others, in their strange jargon."

It is not likely that of the children above referred to (or such like them), "there was not one on the Green who was acquainted with half-a-dozen words of Romany" in 1866, when they arrived at ages ranging from thirty to forty years. Mr. Baird had good opportunities for judging of this subject; and it is not to be thought of that these children should have lost the language at the time Mr. Borrow visited them, when the five, or less than five, words they had they prized so highly that they would "rather part with their hearts' blood than communicate them to a stranger." And the queen's "knowing more Gipsy than anyone in Scotland," must be received with the same reserved consideration.

She then said that if her people on the Green were spoken to on the subject of the language, "they would merely turn up their noses, and say they had no Gaelic. You would not find them so communicative as me. The *Nokkums*, in general, are a dour set, sir" (p. 321). The tricks that were mentioned to her "were occasionally done, not by the *Nokkums*, but by other Gipsies, with whom her people had no connection" (p. 323).

On parting with her, she said she would be delighted to have him call on her the following day, the request being *his*. "On going, however, on the following day, which was Sunday, I found the garden-gate locked and the window-shutters up, plainly denoting that there was nobody at home" (p. 326). She had evidently got frightened at her indiscretion, as is always the case with the Scottish Gipsies, and spread the alarm and fled, leaving "some o' her laddies" to watch the intruder. "Seeing some men lying on the hill, a little way above, who appeared to be observing me, I went up to them for the purpose of making inquiries. They were all young men [the oldest not more than three-and-twenty], and decently, though coarsely, dressed. None wore the Scottish cap or bonnet, but all the hat of England" (p. 326). "I greeted them civilly, but received no salutation in return" (p. 327). Then he tried them with two catch-words, which were answered, in both instances, by a turn-up of the nose, as the queen told him would be the case. "Good-day, said I, and turned away. I received no counter-salutation" (p. 328).

Next day there was to be a fair held near Kelso, to which he went, "determined to be even with her," as he felt sure of meeting her there; but he made a mistake if he imagined *she* would *look* "black-affronted," after giving him the slip, for they "met in the most cordial manner—smirks and giggling on her side, smiles and nodding on mine" (p. 329).

"After the smirks, smiles, and salutations were over, I inquired whether there were many Gipsies in the fair. 'Plenty,' said she, 'plenty Tates, Andersons, Reeds, and many others. That woman is an Anderson—yonder is a Tate,' said she, pointing to two common-looking females. 'Have they much Romany?' said I. 'No,' said she, 'scarcely a word.' 'I think I shall go and speak to them,' said I. 'Don't,' said she; 'they would only be uncivil to you. Moreover, they have nothing of that kind—on the word of a *rawnie*, they have not'" (p. 330).

She had doubtless got frightened at the idea of him compromising her with the other Gipsies at the fair, and letting the cat out of the bag, and as a last resource, to decoy him away from them, added, "on the word of a *rawnie*," that they had *none* of the language, after she had said that they had *scarcely a wora* of it. She could easily be excused for playing him *hukni*, or false, after being trapped into divulging her language; and if she did it once, she could do it again, notwithstanding Mr. Borrow being satisfied to the contrary. The publication of the "interview" should also extenuate the trifling offence, if offence it was. If the Gipsies can be excused for promising a thing and "belying it" in a whisper to themselves, it is when their language is in consideration, for that is the last thing they will generally give to a stranger.

Both the queen and her relation that conducted Mr. Borrow to her he says, had *blue* eyes, which does not seem to have struck him as anything odd when found in the head of a *Gipsy*. Of the queen he says:—

"She was dressed respectably in black, and was holding the arm of a stout wench, dressed in garments of the same colour, who, she said, was her niece, and a *rinkeni rakli*. The girl whom she called *rinkeni*, or handsome, but whom I did not consider handsome

[standards and tastes differ], had much of the appearance of one of those Irish girls, born in London, whom one so frequently sees carrying milk-pails about the streets of the metropolis" (p. 329).

The two Gipsy women whom the queen pointed out to him at the fair he describes as "common-looking females." And the young men, who had evidently been set to watch the "tall lusty man, with a skellying look with the left eye" (p. 322), that entered the village, firing off Gipsy words right and left—so different from the ordinary visitors, who generally come in companies, with females among them—he describes thus:—

"Their countenances were rather dark, but had nothing of the vivacious expression observable in the Gipsy face ['they were lying on their bellies, occasionally kicking their heels into the air'], but much of the dogged, sullen look which makes the countenances of the generality of the Irish who inhabit London and some other of the large English towns so disagreeable" (p. 327]. "They were a hard, sullen, cautious set, in whom a few drops of Gipsy blood were mixed with some Scottish and a much larger quantity of low Irish. Between them and their queen a striking difference was observable. In her there was both fun and cordiality [and doubtless plenty of sullenness and revenge, had they been called forth]; in them not the slightest appearance of either [for they were perhaps ready to fly at him, like so many tigers, whatever frolic or devilment they might indulge in at other times].* What was the cause of this disparity? The reason [and a very odd one indeed] was, they were neither the children nor the grandchildren of real Gipsies, but only the remote descendants, [and, paradoxical as it may appear, still *Gipsies*, owning allegiance to a Gipsy queen], whereas she was the granddaughter of two genuine Gipsies, old Will Faa and his wife [of both of whose pedigrees he is doubtless ignorant], whose daughter was her mother; so that she might be considered all but a thorough Gipsy [even with her blue eyes, and his asking her whether she was a 'mumping woman' or a true Gipsy]; for being by her mother's side a Gipsy, she was of course much more so than she would have been had she sprung from a Gipsy father and a Gentile mother; the qualities of a child, both mental and bodily, depending much less on the father than on the mother [saying nothing of the special Gipsy training the child receives from its mother and her relations, before its earliest recollection, as described in the *Disquisition on the Gipsies*, pages 379–381]. Had her father been a Faa, instead of her mother, I should *probably* never have heard from her lips a single word of Romany [did he never know a case of the kind?], but found her as sullen and inductile as the *Nokkums* [or Gipsies] on the Green [for what reason?], whom it was of little more use questioning than so many stones†" (p. 328).

* The first woman Mr. Borrow spoke to said of old Will Faa's house:—"It still is an inn, and has always been an inn; and though it has such an eerie look, it is sometimes lively enough, more especially after the Gipsies have returned from their summer excursions in the country. It's a roaring place then. They spend most of their sleight-o'-hand gains in that house" (p. 309). [Considering what is popularly understood to be the natural disposition and capacity of the Gipsies, we would readily conclude that to turn innkeepers would be the most unlikely of all their employments; yet that is very common. Mohammed said, "If the mountain will not come to us, we will go to the mountain." The Gipsies say, "If we do not go to the people, the people must come to us;" and so they open their houses of entertainment (Ed., p. 467).]

† The *probability* mentioned by Mr. Borrow would be to the contrary. He says that Thomas Herne, whose mother was a "Gentile of Oxford," when ninety-two years of age, "could not talk much Gipsy, but understood almost all that I said to him" (p. 157). "His face was as red as a winter apple, and his hair was rather red than grey" (p. 155). His son, aged seventy, was in one of the caravans; and of his grandson, aged thirty-five, who was also "around," nothing is said beyond his being "a good-looking and rather well-dressed man, with something of a knowing card in his countenance" (p. 159). The old man admitted he was a half-and-half, but "seemed to be rather ashamed of being of Gipsy blood" (p. 157), and "never had any particular liking for the Gipsy manner of living," although he had followed it all his life, excepting when fourteen years in the militia. This

These Scotch Gipsies seem to have ruffled Mr. Borrow's feathers considerably. He calls them a "hard, sullen, *cautious* set," whom he could not pump; yet he gives them credit for good manners, for he says that as he "went down the hill, there was none of the shouting and laughter which generally follow a discomfited party" (p. 328). They were doubtless glad to see him leave the village, after causing the flight of the queen from it.

There is a good deal to be said in regard to Mr. Borrow's visit to Yetholm. He arrived there "late in the afternoon, at the commencement of August, in the year 1866." The first woman he spoke to took leave of him "to boil water for her tea;" and the next one he saluted with, "A fine evening." By the time he was "presented" to the queen it was probably seven o'clock, and ten when he left her; and if we allow an hour for general conversation, we would have two hours for the Gipsy language, one half of which was in all probability taken up by Mr. Borrow himself.* How, then, did he arrive at the conclusion that the "sum total of her vocabulary barely amounted to three hundred words?" If she had given him them, one after the other, so that he could count them, she would have yielded him five words per minute. But she evidently did not do that, the conversation apparently taking a different turn. His estimate of her language, so far as the number of her words was concerned, was doubtless a vague conjecture. He certainly furnishes no data to enable us to take his view of the question.

No sooner had Mr. Borrow entered the village than he was watched and approached. "Come to see the Gipsy town, sir?" said the first woman, before she had been spoken to. "Does your honour know who once lived in that house? . . That man, your honour, was old Will Faa." The other woman, who was a Gipsy, and related to the queen, and "had her eye on his honour for some time past—expecting to be asked about the queen, for scarcely anybody comes to Yetholm but goes to see the queen"—*looked up when addressed*, and asked, "Come to see the town? . . . and I suppose come to see the Gipsies, too?" with a half smile. "Many gentle folks from England come to see the Gipsy queen of Yetholm. Follow me, sir." The first woman said that the queen was "led about the town once a year, mounted on a cuddy [donkey], with a tin crown on her head, with much shouting, and with many a barbaric ceremony; . . . and some go so far as to say that they merely crowned her queen in hopes of bringing grist to the Gipsy mill" (p. 310). The "calling" of the queen (whose name, I believe, is Esther Blythe) is, therefore, to make herself agreeable; although it could, perhaps, be said of her, that she is like a cat's paw—all velvet, or all claw. "She came towards me with much smiling, smirking, and nodding, as if I had known her for three-score years" (p. 314). But when he addressed her in Gipsy, she exclaimed, in an angry tone, "Why do you talk to me in that manner, and in that gibberish? I don't understand a word of it" (p. 315). And then she said to him:—"You pretend to understand the Gipsy language: if I find you do not, I will hold no further discourse with you; and the sooner you take yourself off the better. If I find you do, I will talk with you as long as you like" (p. 316). "Now, I have but

way of speaking is very common with mixed Gipsies, in their intercourse with others that are outside of their fraternity, and have no sympathy with them. Mr. Borrow says nothing of the relation of the son and grandson of Thomas Herne to the Gipsy tribe generally.

* Mr. Borrow would have been lucky had his interview with the Gipsy lasted three hours.

one more question to ask you, and when I have done so, you may as well go; for I am quite sure you cannot answer it. What is *Nokkum?*" (p. 318.)* The question was answered, and they were immediately on the most confidential of terms. "Observing her eyeing me rather suspiciously, I changed the subject; asking her if she had travelled much about" (p. 324). "Wishing to know her age, I inquired of her what it was. She looked angry [and with much reason], and said she did not know" (p. 326), but acknowledged she was sixty-eight. However the "queen" may levy her taxes, or draw her revenue (in the shape of presents and what not) from others, she behaved with great delicacy or tact with Mr. Borrow. "There was something of the gentlewoman in her: on my offering her money she refused to take it, saying that she did not want it, and it was with the utmost difficulty I persuaded her to accept a trifle, with which, she said, she would buy herself some tea" (p. 326). Then she said she would be delighted to have him call again the next day; but fled from the village, as we have seen.

Mr. Borrow's forte is evidently not in judging of circumstances, and discriminating in character; for, as we have already seen, he contrasted her deportment with that of the "dour set" he addressed with the view of learning what had become of their queen, when he found, on returning to see her, according to appointment, that her house was locked up, and herself not to be found. This is what he said of the two, under the peculiar circumstances of the case:—"Between them and their queen a striking difference was observable. In her there was both fun and cordiality; in them not the slightest appearance of either" (p. 328); the reason being that she had much of "the blood," and they hardly any at all!

Mr. Borrow's visit to Yetholm is otherwise unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it led to no information about the Gipsy population in Scotland, and various matters connected with it. It is true that he had not time to make such an inquiry at the first interview with the queen; but when he met her at the fair, the next day, and found her all "smirks and giggling," he could have made another appointment that she might have kept, and *stuck to her*, in pursuit of knowledge under difficulties, particularly as he had her considerably in his power.

The first woman he met with at Yetholm said:—"There are no Faas to keep it [old Will Faa's house]. The name is clean dead in the land, though there is still some of the

---

* The queen said that the Gipsies have a private name for themselves, which is *Nokkum* or *Nokkums*. In the *History of the Gipsies* we find the following:—"When I have spoken to them in their own words, I have been asked, 'Are you a *Nawken?*' a word to which they attach the meaning of a *wanderer* or *traveller*—one who can do any sort of work for himself that may be required in the world" (p. 340). "*Nawken* has a number of significations, such as Tinkler, Gipsy, a wanderer, a worker in iron, a man who can do anything for himself in the mechanical arts, etc., etc." (p. 315.)

Mr. Borrow's definition of the word is as follows:—"The root of *nokkum* must be *nok*, which signifieth a nose." "Yes, the root of *nokkum* is assuredly *nok;* and I have no doubt that your people call themselves *Nokkum*, because they are in the habit of *nosing* the Gorgios. *Nokkums* means *Nosems*" (p. 318). On hearing this the queen instantly abdicated in his favour, saying, "Sit down, sir, . . . I see there is no danger."

It is interesting to compare Mr. Borrow's spelling of Scottish Gipsy words with that of others, thus:—

English.	*Borrow.*	*Simson.*	*Baird.*
Nose.	Nok.	Nak.	Nak.
Fire.	Yog.	Yak.	Yak.
Stone.	Cloch.	Clack.	Clauch.

He gives *Morbuttle* for Morbattle (anciently *Morebotle*), but that might have been an error of the printer, which could not be said of *Loughmaben* for Lochmaben.

blood remaining" (p. 309); and the queen "said that a great number of the Faas had come in the old time to Yetholm, and settled down there, and that her own forefathers had always been the principal people among them" (p. 322). Now, her great-grandfather, old Will Faa, who died in the year 1783, or 1784, was three times married, and is described in the *History of the Gipsies* as follows:—

On solemn occasions, Will Faa assumed, in his way, all the stately deportment of sovereignty. He had twenty-four children, and at each of their christenings he appeared dressed in his original wedding-robes. These christenings were celebrated with no small parade. Twelve young hand-maidens were always present as part of the family retinue, and for the purpose of waiting on the numerous guests, who assembled to witness the ceremony, or partake of the subsequent festivities. Besides Will's Gipsy associates, several of the neighbouring farmers and lairds, with whom he was on terms of friendly intercourse (among others, the Murrays, of Cherry-trees), used to attend these christenings.—*Blackwood's Magazine* (Ed., p. 252).

And her grandfather (old Will Faa *secundus*), who died in 1847, and for whom a fine "Lament" appeared in the *Scotsman* newspaper, of the 20th October of that year, doubtless left a family, and perhaps a large one at that. I have alluded to one of his brothers, John Faa, in the *History of the Gipsies*, thus:—

Will Faa had a brother, a house-carpenter in New York, who survived him a few years. He was considered a fine old man by those who knew him. He left a family in an humble, but respectable, way of doing. The Scottish Gipsy throne was occupied by another family of Gipsies, in consequence of this family being "forth of Scotland." There are a great many Faas, under one name or other, scattered over the world (Ed., p. 255).

The Gipsies in general are great genealogists, and the queen in particular must, doubtless, have been aware of what had become of many of this Faa clan, that was so numerous about Yetholm, and in Scotland generally. She could doubtless have told Mr. Borrow a great deal on the subject, had he asked her, and found her communicative in regard to it. But what becomes of the Gipsies, is a question that cannot be settled by reference to any of Mr. Borrow's writings, although these contain a few incidental remarks that throw some light on it, when information of a positive and circumstantial nature is added. The account which he has given of his visit to Yetholm confirms what is set forth in the *History of the Gipsies*, as regards the secrecy of the race in connection with their language, and the greatly mixed state of "the blood" in Scotland. In the *History of the Gipsies* we find the following:—

The Scottish Gipsies appear to be extremely tenacious of retaining their language, as their principal secret, among themselves, and seem, from what I have read on the subject, to be much less communicative, on this and other matters relative to their history, than those of England and other countries. On speaking to them of their speech, they exhibit an extraordinary degree of fear, caution, reluctance, distrust, and suspicion; and, rather than give any information on the subject, will submit to any self-denial (p. 281), although the people themselves have lived amongst us for three hundred and fifty years, and talked it every hour of the day, but hardly ever in the hearing of the other inhabitants, excepting, occasionally, a word of it now and then, to disguise their discourse from those around them; which, on being questioned, they have always passed off for *cant*, to prevent the law taking hold of them, and punishing them for being Gipsies. These details will also show that our Scottish Tinklers, or Gipsies, are sprung from the common stock from which are descended those that are to be found in the other parts of Europe, as well as those that are scattered over the world generally; what secrecy they observe in all matters relative to their affairs; what

an extraordinary degree of reluctance and fear they evince in answering questions tending to develop their history; and, consequently, how difficult it is to learn anything satisfactory about them (p, 291).

In dealing with Mr. Borrow, the great thing to be aimed at is to get him committed to some point that can be tested by means out of himself, so as to get rid of assertion and counter-assertion in any question that may be raised with him. He furnishes a very satisfactory one when he says:—"There are only two names of trades which have been adopted by English Gipsies as proper names—Cooper and Smith" (p. 225). If he had turned to Hoyland's *Survey of the Gipsies*, he would have found, in addition to these, the names of Taylor, Draper, and Glover. One English Gipsy family I know of the name of Brewer, and there are doubtless a variety of such names. As illustrating the surnames of English Gipsies, I mention two families of the names of Herring and Salmon: the first I know from reliable information, and the other from personal intimacy, that is, Gipsies by admission, and speaking the language in my hearing. Had Mr. Borrow said that the only names of trades adopted by the English Gipsies for surnames were two *that he knew of*, the expression could have been allowed to pass; but when he asserts that the only *two in England* are Cooper and Smith, we have beyond question an incontrovertible proof of his unreliability on the subject which he treats. A trifle like this indicates character. A variety of similar things prove that Mr. Borrow can be relied on only when he describes what he has actually seen and heard; and even these must sometimes be taken as passed through his peculiar mind.

Mr. Borrow writes:—

"At the commencement of the last century, and for a considerable time afterwards, there was a loud cry raised against the Gipsy women for stealing children. This cry, however, was quite as devoid of reason as the suspicion entertained of old against the Gipsy communities of harbouring disguised priests. Gipsy women, as the writer had occasion to remark many a long year ago, have plenty of children of their own, and have no wish to encumber themselves with those of other people" (p. 217).

Here is what is said in the *History of the Gipsies* on that subject:—

Among many other mal-practices, the Gipsies have, in all countries, been accused of stealing children; but what became of these kidnapped infants, no one appears to have given any account, that I am aware of. To satisfy myself on this trait of their character, I inquired of a Gipsy the reasons which induced his tribe to steal children. He candidly acknowledged the practice, and said that the stolen children were adopted as members of the tribe, and instructed in the language, and all the mysteries of the body. They became, he said, equally hardy, clever, and expert in all the practices of the fraternity. The male Gipsies were very fond of marrying the stolen females. Some of the kidnappped children were made servants, or, rather, a sort of slaves to the tribe. They considered that the occasional introduction of another race into their own, and mixing the Gipsy blood, in that manner, invigorated and strengthened their race. In this manner would the Gipsies alter the complexion of their race, by the introduction of foreign blood among them (p. 342).

The persecutions to which the Gipsies were exposed, merely for being Gipsies, which their appearance would readily indicate, seem to have induced the body to intermarry with our race, so as to disguise theirs. That would be done by receiving and adopting males of our race, whom they would marry to females of theirs, who would bring up the children of such unions as members of their fraternity. They also adopted the practice to give their race stamina, as well as numbers, to contend with the people among whom they lived. The desire of having servants (for Gipsies generally have been too proud to do menial work for each other), led to many children being kidnapped, and reared among them;

many of whom, as is customary with Oriental people, rose to as high a position in the tribe as any of themselves. Then again, it was very necessary to have people of fair complexion among them, to enable them the more easily to carry on their operations upon the community, as well as to contribute to their support during times of persecution. Owing to these causes, and the occasional occurrence of white people being, by more legitimate means, received into their body, which would be more often the case in their palmy days, the half, at least, of the Scottish Gipsies are of fair hair and blue eyes (Ed., p. 9).

Mr. Borrow labours under a very serious mistake when he asserts that "The unfounded idea, that Gipsies steal children, to bring them up as Gipsies, has been the besetting sin of authors, who have attempted to found works of fiction on the way of life of this most singular people." The only argument which he advances to refute this belief in regard to Gipsies, which is universal, is the following:—"They have plenty of children of their own, whom they can scarcely support; and they would smile at the idea of encumbering themselves with the children of others." This is rather inconsistent with his own words, when he says:—"I have dealt more in facts than theories, of which I am, in general, no friend." As a matter of fact, children have been stolen and brought up as Gipsies, and incorporated with the tribe (Ed., p. 9). There was no occasion for such children being either "squalling infants," or of such an age as was likely to lead them to "betray the Gipsies," as Mr. Borrow supposes would be the case, when he says that Gipsies have never stolen children, to bring them up as Gipsies (Ed., p. 342).

This is the only continental writer, [Wiessenburch] that I am aware of, who mentions the circumstance of the Gipsies having districts to themselves, from which others of their race were excluded. This author also speaks of the German Gipsies stealing children. John Bunyan admits the same practice in England, when he compares his feelings, as a sinner, to those of a child carried off by Gipsies. He gives the Gipsy *women* credit for this practice (Ed., p. 80).

Mr. Borrow says:—

"A yet more extraordinary charge was, likewise, brought against them—of running away with wenches. Now, the idea of Gipsy women running away with wenches! [A most likely thing indeed, when the Spanish Gipsy women have been described by him as the greatest of procuresses, and the English ones as 'living in almost continual violation of the laws intended for the protection of society' (p. 219.)] Where were they to stow them in the event of running away with them? [Aye, where indeed? Why, anywhere; for if they could *run* them, they would surely have no difficulty in *stowing* them.] And what were they to do with them in the event of being able to stow them?" (p. 217.) [Why, make money by them.]

It is difficult to see how this idea of "running away with wenches," could have found its way into this work of Mr. Borrow, when he had no means of refuting it beyond the funny remarks he makes on the subject. The circumstance is highly characteristic of his erratic genius. He says:—"For nearly a century and a half after the death of Elizabeth the Gipsies seem to have been left tolerably to themselves, for the laws are almost silent respecting them" (p. 216), for the reason that there was no necessity to *pass* laws against them while those of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth were on the Statute Book. These were sufficiently severe and comprehensive to make others unnecessary. How they were sometimes put in force is illustrated by the execution of thirteen Gipsies "at one Suffolk assize," a few years before the restoration of Charles II.* Mr. Borrow says that for one hundred and fifty years after the death of Elizabeth, "but next to nothing is known respecting them" [the Gipsies] (p. 216); which is a good reason why he should not have so dogmatically asserted that the Gipsies never harboured disguised priests (no moral

* This appears to have been the last instance of inflicting the penalty of death on these unfortunate people in England, merely because they were Gipsies (p. 92).

offence), run wenches, or stole children.

The following extracts will illustrate Mr. Borrow's singular inconsistencies in regard to the mental peculiarities of the Gipsies when speaking their language :—

Before considering this trait in the character of the Scottish Gipsies [in regard to keeping their language a secret], it may interest the reader to know that the same peculiarity obtains among those on the continent.

Of the Hungarian Gipsies, Grellmann writes :—" It will be recollected, from the first, how great a secret they make of their language, and how suspicious they appear when any person wishes to learn a few words of it. Even if the Gipsy is not perverse, he is very inattentive, and is consequently likely to answer some other rather than the true Gipsy word."—Of the Hungarian Gipsies, Bright says :—" No one, who has not had experience, can conceive the difficulty of gaining intelligible information, from people so rude, upon the subject of their language. If you ask for a word, they give you a whole sentence ; and on asking a second time, they give the sentence a totally different turn, or introduce some figure altogether new. Thus it was with our Gipsy, who, at length, tired of our questions, prayed most piteously to be released ; which we granted him, only on condition of his returning in the evening."—Of the Spanish Gipsies, Mr. Borrow writes :—" It is only by listening attentively to the speech of the Gitanos, whilst discoursing among themselves, that an acquaintance with their dialect can be formed, and by seizing upon all unknown words, as they fall in succession from their lips. Nothing can be more useless and hopeless than the attempt to obtain possession of their vocabulary, by inquiring of them how particular objects and ideas are styled in the same ; for, with the exception of the names of the most common things, they are totally incapable, as a Spanish writer has observed, of yielding the required information ; owing to their great ignorance, the shortness of their memories, or rather the state of bewilderment to which their minds are brought by any question which tends to bring their reasoning faculties into action ; though, not unfrequently, the very words which have been in vain required of them will, a minute subsequently, proceed inadvertently from their mouths."—What has been said by the two last-named writers is very wide of the mark ; Grellmann, however, hits it exactly. The Gipsies have excellent memories. It is all they have to depend on. If they had not good memories, how could they, at the present day, speak a word of their language at all? The difficulty in question is downright shuffling, and not a want of memory on the part of the Gipsy. The present chapter will throw some light on the subject. Even Mr. Borrow himself gives an ample refutation to his sweeping account of the Spanish Gipsies, in regard to their language ; for, in another part of his work, he says :—" I recited the Apostles' Creed to the Gipsies, sentence by sentence, which they translated as I proceeded. They exhibited the greatest eagerness and interest in their unwonted occupation, and frequently broke into loud disputes as to the best rendering, many being offered at the same time. I then read the translation aloud, whereupon they raised a shout of exultation, and appeared not a little proud of the composition." On this occasion, Mr. Borrow evidently had the Gipsies in the right humour—that is, off their guard, excited, and much interested in the subject. He says, in another place :—" The language they speak among themselves, and they are particularly anxious to keep others in ignorance of it." As a general thing, they seem to have been bored by people much above them in the scale of society ; with whom their natural politeness, and expectations of money or other benefits, would naturally lead them to do anything than give them that which is inborn in their nature to keep to themselves (Ed., p. 281).

Besides the difficulties mentioned in the way of getting any of their language from them, there is a general one that arises from the suspicious, unsettled, restless, fickle and volatile nature by which they are characterized. It is a rare thing to get them to speak consecutively for more than a few minutes on any subject, thus precluding the possibility, in most instances, of taking advantage of any favourable humour in which they may be found, in the matter of their general history—leaving alone the formal and serious procedure necessary to be followed in regard to their language.

If this favourable turn in their disposition is allowed to pass, it is rarely anything of that nature can be got from them at that meeting; and it is extremely likely that, at any after interviews, they will entirely evade the matter so much desired (p. 286).

Sir Walter Scott seems to have had an intention of writing an account of the Gipsies himself; for, in a letter to Murray, as given by Lockhart, he writes:—"I have been over head and ears in work this summer, or I would have sent the Gipsies; indeed, I was partly stopped by finding it impossible to procure a few words of their language" (Ed., p. 25).

In regard to the mixture of the blood, and the destiny of the mixed breeds, and that of the tribe generally, in Spain, the following extracts are taken from the *History of the Gipsies*, and have reference to Mr. Borrow's observations and opinions on the subject:—

The effect of a marriage between a White and a Gipsy, especially if he or she is known to be a Gipsy, is such that the White instinctively withdraws from any connexion with his own race, and casts his lot with the Gipsies. The children born of such unions become ultra Gipsies. A very fine illustration of this principle of half-breed ultra Gipsyism is given by Mr. Borrow, in his *Gipsies in Spain*, in the case of an officer in the Spanish army adopting a young female Gipsy child, whose parents had been executed, and educating and marrying her. A son of this marriage, who rose to be a captain in the service of Donna Isabel, hated the white race so intensely, as, when a child, to tell his father that he wished he (his father) was dead. At whose door must the cause of such a feeling be laid? One would naturally suppose that the child would have left, perhaps despised, his mother's people, and clung to those whom the world deemed respectable. But the case was different. Suppose the mother had not been prompted by some of her own race, while growing up, and the son, in his turn, not prompted by the mother, all that was necessary to stir up his hatred toward the white race, was simply to know who he was (Ed., p. 372).

This Spanish Gipsy is reported by Mr. Borrow to have said:—"She, however, remembered her blood, and hated my father, and taught me to hate him likewise. When a boy, I used to stroll about the plain that I might not see my father; and my father would follow me, and beg me to look upon him, and would ask me what I wanted; and I would reply, 'Father, the only thing I want is to see you dead!'"—This is certainly an extreme instance of the result of the prejudice against the Gipsy race; and no opinion can be formed upon it, without knowing some of the circumstances connected with the feelings of the father, or of his relations, toward the mother and the Gipsy race generally. This Gipsy woman seems to have been well brought up by her protector and husband; for she *taught her child Gipsy from a MS.*, and procured a teacher to instruct him in Latin. There are many reflections to be drawn from the circumstances connected with this Spanish Gipsy family, but they do not seem to have occurred to Mr. Borrow * (Ed., p. 373).

This brings me to an issue with Mr. Borrow. Speaking of the destination of the Spanish Gipsies, he says: "If the Gitanos are abandoned to themselves, by which we mean, no arbitrary laws are again enacted for their extinction, the sect will eventually cease to be, and its members become confounded with the residue of the population." I can well understand that such procedure, on the part of the Spanish Government, was calculated to soften the ferocious disposition of the Gipsies; but did it bring them a point nearer to

* Of the mixed Spanish Gipsy, to whom I have alluded, Mr. Borrow says, that "he had *flaxen hair;* his eyes small, and like ferrets, red and fiery; and his complexion like a brick, or dull red, chequered with spots of purple." This description, with, perhaps, the exception of the red eyes, and spots of purple, is quite in keeping with that of many of the mixed Gipsies. The race seems even to have given a preference to fair or red hair, in the case of such children and grown-up natives as they have adopted into their body (Ed., p. 377).

To thoroughly understand how a Gipsy, with fair hair and blue eyes, can be as much a Gipsy as one with black, may be termed "passing the *pons asinorum* of the Gipsy question." Once over the bridge, and there are no difficulties to be encountered on the journey, unless it be to understand that a Gipsy can be a Gipsy

an amalgamation with the people than before? Mr. Borrow continues:—"The position which they occupy is the lowest. . . . The outcast of the prison and the *presidio*, who calls himself Spaniard, would feel insulted by being termed Gitano, and would thank God that he is not." He continues:—"It is, of course, by intermarriage, alone, that the two races will ever commingle; and before that event is brought about, much modification must take place amongst the Gitanos, in their manners, in their habits, in their affections and their dislikes, and perhaps *even in their physical peculiarities* [yet 'no washing,' as Mr. Borrow approvingly quotes, 'will turn the Gipsy white']; much must be forgotten on both sides, and everything is forgotten in course of time."

Mr. Borrow has not sufficiently examined into Spanish Gipsyism to pass a reliable opinion upon it. He says:—"One thing is certain in the history of the Gitanos, that the sect flourished and increased, so long as the law recommended and enjoined measures the most harsh and severe for its suppression. . . . . The caste of the Gitanos still exists, but is neither so extensive, nor so formidable, as a century ago, when the law, in denouncing Gitanismo, proposed to the Gitanos the alternatives of death for persisting in their profession, or slavery for abandoning it." These are very singular alternatives. The latter is certainly not to be found in any of the Spanish laws quoted by Mr. Borrow. I am at a loss to perceive the point of his reasoning. There can be no difficulty in believing that Gipsies would rather *increase* in a state of peace, than if they were hunted from place to place, like wild beasts; and consequently, having renounced their former mode of life, they would, in Mr. Borrow's own words, "cease to play a distinct part in the history of Spain, and the *law* would no longer speak of them as a distinct people." And the same might, to a certain extent, be said of the Spanish *people*. Mr. Borrow again says:—"That the Gitanos are not so numerous as in former times, witness those *barrios*, in various towns, still denominated *Gitanerias*, but from whence the Gitanos have disappeared, even like the Moors from the *Moreriâs*." But Mr. Borrow himself, in the same work, gives a good reason for the disappearance of the Gipsies from these *Gitanerias;* for he says:—"The *Gitanerias* were soon considered as public nuisances, on which account the Gitanos were forbidden to live together in particular parts of the town, to hold meetings, and even to intermarry with each other." If the disappearance of the Gipsies from Spain was like that of the Moors, it would appear that they had left, or been expelled from, the country; a theory which Mr. Borrow does not advance. The Gipsies, to a certain extent, may have left these barrios, or been expelled from them, and settled as tradesmen, mechanics, and what not, in other parts of the same or other towns, so as to be in a position the more able to get on in the world. Still, many of them are in the colonies. In Cuba there are many, as soldiers and musicians, dealers in mules and red pepper, which businesses they almost monopolize, and jobbers and dealers in various wares; and doubtless there are some of them innkeepers, and others following other occupations. In Mexico there are not a few. I know of a Gitano who has a fine wholesale and retail cigar store in Virginia.*

Mr. Borrow concludes, in regard to

---

without living in a tent or being a rogue (Ed., p. 383).

Grellmann evidently alludes to Gipsies of mixed blood, when he writes in the following manner:—"Experience shows that the dark colour of the Gipsies, which is continued from generation to generation, is more the effect of education and manner of life than descent. Among those who profess music in Hungary, or serve in the imperial army, where they have learned to pay more attention to order and cleanliness, there are many to be found whose extraction is not at all discernible in their colour." For my part, I cannot say that such language is applicable to full-blood Gipsies. Still, the change from tented to settled and tidy Gipsydom is apt to show its effects in modifying the complexion of such Gipsies, and to a much greater degree in their descendants (Ed., p. 377).

* Mr. Borrow mentions in the twenty-second chapter of the *Bible in Spain*, having met several cavalry soldiers from Granada, Gipsies *incog.*, who were surprised at being discovered to be Gipsies. They had been impressed, but carried on a trade in horses, in league with the captain of their company. They said:—"We have been to the wars, but not to fight; we left that to the Busné. We have kept together, and like true Caloré, have stood

the Spanish Gipsies, thus:—"We have already expressed our belief that the caste has diminished of latter years; whether this diminution was the result of one or many causes combined; of a *partial change of habits*, of pestilence or sickness, of war or famine, or of a *freer intercourse with the Spanish population*, we have no means of determining, and shall abstain from offering conjectures on the subject." In this way does he leave the question just where he found it. Is there any reason to doubt that Gipsydom is essentially the same in Spain as in Great Britain; or that its future will be guided by any other principles than those which regulate that of the British Gipsies? Indeed, I am astonished that Mr. Borrow should advance the idea that Gipsies should *decrease* by "changing their habits;" they might not *increase so fast* in a settled life, as when more exposed to the air, and not molested by the Spanish Government. I am no less astonished that he should think they would decrease by "a freer intercourse with the Spanish population;" when, in fact, such mixtures are well known to go with the Gipsies; the mixture being, in the estimation of the British Gipsies, calculated to strengthen and invigorate the race itself. Had Mr. Borrow kept in mind the case of the half-blood Gipsy captain, he could have had no difficulty in learning what became of mixed Gipsies.*

It doubtless holds in Spain, as in Great Britain, that as the Gipsy enters into settled life, and engages in a respectable calling, he hides his descent, and even mixes his blood with that of the country, and becomes ashamed of the name before the public; but is as much, at heart, a Gipsy, as any others of his race. And this theory is borne out by Mr. Borrow himself, when he speaks of "the unwillingness of the Spanish Gipsies to utter, when speaking of themselves, the detested expression Gitano; a word which seldom escapes their mouths." We might therefore conclude, that the Spanish Gipsies, with the exception of the more original and bigoted stock, would *hide their nationality* from the common Spaniards, and so escape their notice. It is not at all likely that the half-blood Gipsy captain would mention to the public that he was a Gipsy, although he admitted it to Mr. Borrow, under the peculiar circumstances in which he met him. My Spanish acquaintance informs me that the Gitanos generally hide their nationality from the rest of the world.

Such a case is evidently told by Mr. Borrow, in the vagabond Gipsy, Antonio, at Badajoz, who termed a rich Gipsy, living in the same town, a hog, because he evidently would not countenance him. Antonio may possibly have been kicked out of his house, in attempting to enter it. He accused him of having married a Spaniard, and of fain attempting to pass himself for a Spaniard. As regards the wife, she might have been a Gipsy with very little of "the blood" in her veins; or a Spaniard reared by Gipsies; or an ordinary Spanish maiden, to whom the Gipsy would teach his language, as sometimes happens among the English

blo

back to back. We have made money in the wars" (Ed., p. 392).

It would seem that the law in Spain, in regard to the Gipsies, stands pretty much where it did—that is, the people are, in a sense, tolerated, but that the use of their language is prohibited, as may be gathered from an incident mentioned in the ninth chapter of the *Bible in Spain*, by Mr. Borrow" (Ed., p. 395).

* Mr. Borrow surely cannot mean that a Gipsy ceases to be a Gipsy when he settles down, and "turns over a new leaf;" and that this "change of habits" changes his descent, blood, appearance, language and nationality! What, then, does he mean, when he says, that the Spanish Gipsies have decreased by "a partial change of habits?" And does an infusion of Spanish blood, implied in a "freer intercourse with the Spanish population," lead to the Gipsy element being wiped out; or does it lead to the Spanish feeling being lost in Gipsydom? Which is the element to be operated upon—the Spanish or the Gipsy? Which is the *leaven?* The Spanish element is the *passive*, the Gipsy the *active*. As a question of philosophy, the most simple of comprehension, and, above all, as a matter of fact, the foreign element introduced, *in detail*, into the *body* of Gipsydom, goes with that body, and, in feeling, becomes incorporated with it, although, in physical appearance, it changes the Gipsy race, so that it becomes "confounded with the residue of the population," but remains Gipsy, as before. A Spanish Gipsy is a Spaniard as he stands, and it would be hard to say what we should ask him to do, to become more a Spaniard than he is already (Ed., p. 390).

Gipsies. His wishing to pass for a Spaniard had nothing to do with his being, but not wishing to be known as, a Gipsy. The same is done by almost all our Scottish Gipsies. In England, those who do not follow the tent—I mean the more mixed and better class—are even afraid of each other. "Afraid of what?" said I, to such an English Gipsy; "ashamed of being Gipsies?" "No, sir" (with great emphasis); "not ashamed of being Gipsies, but of being *known to other people as Gipsies.*" "A world of difference," I replied. What does the world hold to be a *Gipsy*, and what does it hold to be the *feelings of a man?* If we consider these two questions, we can have little difficulty in understanding the wish of such Gipsies to disguise themselves. It is in this way, and in the mixing of the blood, that this so-called "dying out of the Gipsies" is to be accounted for.—If Mr. Borrow found in Spain a half-pay captain in the service of Donna Isabel, with *flaxen* hair, a *thorough Gipsy*, who spoke Gipsy and Latin with great fluency, and his cousin, Jara, in all probability another Gipsy, what difficulty can there be in believing that the "foreign tinkers," or tinkers of any kind, now to be met with in Spain, are, like the same class in Great Britain and Ireland, Gipsies of mixed blood? Indeed, the young Spaniard, to whom I have alluded, informs me that the Gipsies in Spain are very much mixed. Mr. Borrow himself admits that the Gipsy blood in Spain has been mixed; for, in speaking of the old Gipsy counts, he says:—"It was the counts who determined what individuals were to be admitted into the fellowship and privileges of the Gitanos. . . . . They [the Gipsies] were not to teach the language to any but those who, by birth or *inauguration*, belonged to that sect." And he gives a case in point, in the bookseller of Logrono, who was married to the only daughter of a Gitano count; upon whose death, the daughter and son-in-law succeeded to the authority which he had exercised in the tribe. If the Gipsies in Spain were not mixed in point of blood, why should they have taken Mr. Borrow for a Gipsy, as he said they did? The persecutions to which the race in Spain were subjected were calculated to lead to a mixture of the blood, as in Scotland, for reasons given in the Preface; but perhaps not to the same extent; as the Spanish Acts seem to have given the tribe an opportunity of escape, under the condition of settling, etc., which would probably be complied with nominally, for the time being; while the face of part of the country would afford a refuge till the storm had blown over * (Ed., pp. 385–397).

I have said a great deal in the *History of the Gipsies* about the blood getting mixed, and how it maintains and perpetuates its identity in that state. The following are extracts bearing on the subject generally:—

Even in England, those that pass for Gipsies are few in number, compared to

* The popular idea of a Gipsy, at the present day, is very erroneous as to its extent and meaning. The nomadic Gipsies constitute but a portion of the race, and a very small portion of it. A gradual change has come over their outward condition all over Europe, from about the commencement of the first American war, but from what time previous to that, we have no certain data from which to form an opinion. In the whole of Great Britain they have been very much mixed with the native blood of the country, but nowhere, I believe, so much so as in Scotland. There is every reason to suppose that the same mixture has taken place in Europe generally, although its effects are not so observable in the Southern countries—from the circumstance of the people there being, for the most part, of dark hair and complexion—as in those lying further toward the North. But this circumstance would, to a certain extent, prevent the mixture which has taken place in countries the inhabitants of which have fair hair and complexions (Ed., p. 8).

In Great Britain, the Gipsies are entitled, in one respect at least, to be called Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen; for their general ideas as men, as distinguished from their being Gipsies, and their language, indicate them, at once, to be such, nearly as much as the common natives of these countries. A half or mixed breed might more especially be termed or pass for a native; so that, by clinging to the Gipsies, and hiding his Gipsy descent and affiliation from the native race, he would lose nothing of the outward character of an ordinary inhabitant; while any benefit arising from his being a Gipsy would, at the same time, be enjoyed by him (Ed., p. 372).

the mixed Gipsies, following various occupations; for a large part of the Gipsy blood in England has, as it were, been spread over a large surface of the White. In Scotland it is almost altogether so (Ed., p. 395).—I may, indeed, venture to assert that there is not a full-blooded Gipsy in Scotland; and most positively that, in England, where the race is held to be so pure, all that can be said of *some* families is that they have not been crossed, *as far as is known*; but that, with these exceptions, the body is much mixed; "dreadfully mixed" is the Gipsies' description, as in many instances my own eyes have witnessed (Ed., p. 374).

Among the English Gipsies, fair-haired ones are looked upon by the purer sort, or even by those taking after the Gipsy, as "small potatoes." The consequence is, they have to make up for their want of blood, by smartness, knowledge of the language, or something that will go to balance the deficiency of blood. They generally lay claim to the *intellect*, while they yield the *blood* to the others. A full or nearly full-blood young English Gipsy looks upon herself with all the pride of a little duchess, while in the company of young male mixed Gipsies. A mixed Gipsy may reasonably be assumed to be more intelligent than one of the old stock, were it only for this reason, that the mixture softens down the natural conceit and bigotry of the Gipsy; while, as regards his personal appearance, it puts him in a more improvable position.* Still, a full-blood Gipsy looks up to a mixed Gipsy, if he is anything of a superior man, and freely acknowledges the blood. Indeed, the two kinds will readily marry, if circumstances bring them together. To a couple of such Gipsies I said:—"What difference does it make, if the person *has the blood, and has his heart in the right place?*" "That's the idea; that's exactly the idea," they both replied (Ed., p. 382).

Various of the characters mentioned in Mr. Borrow's *Lavengro* and *Romany Rye* are, beyond doubt, Gipsies. Old Fulcher is termed, in a derisive manner, by Ursula, "a *gorgio* and basket-maker." She is one of the Hernes; a family which *gorgio* and basket-maker Gipsies describe as "an ignorant and conceited set, who think nothing of other Gipsies, owing to the quality and quantity of their own blood." This is the manner in which the more original and pure and the other kind of English Gipsies frequently talk of each other. The latter will deny that they are Gipsies, at least hide it from the world; and, like the same kind of Scottish Gipsies, speak of the others, exclusively, as Gipsies. I am acquainted with a fair-haired English Gipsy, whose wife, now dead, was a half-breed. "But I am not a Gipsy," said he to me, very abruptly, before I had said anything that could have induced him to think that I took him for one. He spoke Gipsy, like the others. I soon caught him tripping; for, in speaking of the size of Gipsy families, he slipped his foot, and said, "For example, there is our family;

* We naturally ask, what effect has this difference in appearance upon two such members of one family—the one with European, the other with Gipsy features and colour? and the answer is this:—The first will hide the fact of his being a Gipsy from strangers; indeed, he is ashamed to let it be known that he is a Gipsy; and he is afraid that people, not knowing how it came about, would laugh at him. "What!" they would ask, "*you* a Gipsy? The idea is absurd." Besides, it facilitates his getting on in the world, to prevent its being known that he is a Gipsy. The other member cannot deny that he is a Gipsy, because anyone can see it. Such are the Gipsies who are more apt to cling to the tent, or the more original ways of the old stock. They are very proud of their appearance; but it is a pride accompanied with disadvantages and even pain. For, after all, the beauty and pleasure in being a Gipsy is to have the other cast of features and colour; he has as much of the blood and language as the other, while he can go into any kind of company—a sort of Jack-the-Giant-Killer in his invisible coat. The nearer the Gipsy comes to the original colour of his race, the less chance is there of improving him. He knows what he is like; and well does he know the feeling that people entertain for him. In fact, he feels that there is no use in being anything but what people call a Gipsy. But it is different with those of European countenance and colour, or when these have been modified or diluted by a mixture of white blood. They can, then, enter upon any sphere of employment to which they have a mind, and their personal advantages and outward circumstances will admit of (Ed., p. 382).

there were (so many) of us." There is another Gipsy, a neighbour, who passes his wife off to the public as an Irish woman, while she is a fair-haired Irish Gipsy. Both, in short, played upon the word Gipsy; for, as regards fullness of blood, they really were not Gipsies (Ed., p. 509).—In England are to be found Gipsies of many occupations—horse-dealers, livery-stable keepers, public-house keepers, sometimes grocers and linen-drapers; indeed, almost every occupation from these downwards. I can readily enough believe an English Gipsy, when he tells me that he knows of an English squire a Gipsy. To have an English squire a Gipsy, might have come about even in this way: Imagine a rollicking or eccentric English squire taking up with, and marrying, say, a pretty mixed Gipsy bar or lady's maid, and the children would be brought up Gipsies, for certainty.—There are two Gipsies, of the name of B———, farmers upon the estate of Lord Lister, near Massingham, in the county of Norfolk. They are described as good-sized, handsome men, and swarthy, with long black hair, combed over their shoulders. They dress in the old Gipsy stylish fashion, with a green cut-away, or Newmarket, coat, yellow leather breeches, buttoned at the knee, and top-boots, with a Gipsy hat, ruffled breast, and turn-down collar. They occupy the position of any natives in society; attend church, take an interest in parish matters, dine with his lordship's other tenants, and compete for prizes at the agricultural shows. They are proud of being Gipsies. I have also been told that there are Gipsies in the county of Kent, who have hop farms and dairies (Ed., p. 509).

The following extracts are descriptive of the Irish Gipsies to be found in the British Islands and the United States of America:—

Gipsies have informed me that Ireland contains a great many of the tribe; many of whom are now finding their way into Scotland (p. 93).—The Gipsies in Scotland consider themselves to be of the same stock as those in England and Ireland, for they are all acquainted with the same speech. They afford assistance to one another, whenever they happen to meet. The following facts will at least show that the Scottish and Irish Gipsies are one and the same people (p. 324).—These facts prove that the Irish Gipsies have the same language as those in Scotland. The English Gipsy is substantially the same. There are a great many Irish Gipsies travelling in Scotland, of whom I will again speak, in the following chapter. They are not easily distinguished from common Irish peasants, except that they are generally employed in some sort of traffic, such as hawking earthen-ware, trinkets, and various other trifles, through the country (p. 329).—It is only about twenty-five years since the Irish Gipsies, in bands, made their appearance in Scotland. Many severe conflicts they had with our Scottish tribes, before they obtained a footing in the country. But there is a new swarm of Irish Gipsies at present scattered, in bands, over Scotland, all acquainted with the Gipsy language. They are a set of the most wretched creatures on the face of the earth (p. 356).—But there are Irish Gipsies of a class much superior to the above, in Scotland. In 1836, a very respectable and wealthy master-tradesman informed me that the whole of the individuals employed in his manufactory, in Edinburgh, were Irish Gipsies (p. 358).

This invasion of Scotland by Irish Gipsies has, of late years, greatly altered the condition of the nomadic Scottish tribes; for this reason, that as Scotland, no less than any other country, can support only a certain number of such people who "live on the roads," so many of the Scottish Gipsies have been forced to betake themselves to other modes of making a living. To such an extent has this been the case, that Gipsies, speaking the Scottish dialect, are in some districts comparatively rarely to be met with, where they were formerly numerous. The same cause may even lead to the extinction of the Scottish Gipsies as wanderers; but as the descendants of the Irish Gipsies will acquire the Scottish vernacular in the second generation (a remarkably short period among the Gipsies), what will then pass for Scottish Gipsies will be Irish by descent. The Irish Gipsies are allowed, by their English brethren, to speak good Gipsy, but with a broad and vulgar accent; so that the language in Scotland will have a still better chance of being preserved.—England has likewise been invaded by these Irish swarms. The English Gipsies complain bitterly of them. "They have no law among

them," they say; "they have fairly destroyed Scotland as a country to travel in; if they get a loan of anything from the country-people, to wrap themselves in, in the barn, at night, they will decamp with it in the morning. They have brought a disgrace upon the very name of Gipsy, in Scotland, and are heartily disliked by both English and Scotch." "There is a family of Irish Gipsies living across the road there, whom I would not be seen speaking to," said a superior English Gipsy; "I hate a Jew, and I dislike an Irish Gipsy." But English and Scottish Gipsies pull well together; and are on very friendly terms in America, and frequently visit each other. The English sympathize with the Scottish, under the wrongs they have experienced at the hands of the Irish, as well as on account of the persecutions they experienced in Scotland, so long after such had ceased in England.—Twenty-five years ago, there were many Gipsies to be found between Londonderry and Belfast, following the style of life described under the chapter of Tweeddale and Clydesdale Gipsies. Their names were Docherty, McCurdy, McCloskey, McGuire, McKay, Holmes, Dinsmore, Morrow, Allan, Stewart, Lindsay, Cochrane, and Williamson. Some of these seem to have migrated from Scotland and the North of England.—In England, some of the Irish Gipsies send their children to learn trades. There are many of such Irish mechanic Gipsies in America. A short time ago, a company of them landed in New York, and proceeded on to Chicago. Their occupations, among others, were those of hatters and tailors (Ed., p. 357).

Mr. Borrow speaks of three kinds of travelling people in England, which he says the so-called Gipsies proper designate under the names of *Chorodies*, *Kora-mengre*, and *Hindity-mengre*. Of the first he says:—

"The trades of the men are tinkering and basket-making, and some few 'peel the stick' [that is, make skewers]. The women go about with the articles made by their husbands, or rather partners, and sometimes do a little in the fortune-telling line" (p. 267). Those he met at Wandsworth "live in the vilest tents, with the exception of two or three families, who have their abode in broken and filthy caravans. They have none of the comforts and elegancies of the Gipsies" (p. 267). "They have coarse, vulgar features, and hair which puts one wonderfully in mind of refuse flax, or the material of which mops are composed [a very good description of fair, mixed Gipsies]. Their complexions, when not obscured with grime, are rather fair than dark, evidencing that their origin is low, swinish Saxon, and not gentle Romany. Their language is the frowsiest English, interlarded with cant expressions and a few words of bastard Romany" (p. 267) [a point worth noticing]. But they say of themselves, "We are no Gipsies—not we! no, nor Irish either. We are English, and decent folks—none of your rubbish."* "The Gipsies hold them, and with reason, in supreme contempt, and it is from them that they got their name of *Chorodies*" (p. 268) [*Choredo*, in Gipsy, signifying a poor, miserable person].

"The *Kora-mengre* are the lowest of those hawkers who go about the country villages and the streets of London, with caravans hung about with various common articles, such as mats, brooms, mops, tin pans, and kettles. These low hawkers seem to be of much the same origin as the *Chorodies* [whatever that is], and are almost equally brutal and repulsive in their manners. The name *Kora-mengre* is Gipsy, and signifies fellows who cry out and shout, from their practice of shouting out the names of their goods" (p. 268).

"Lastly come the *Hindity-mengre*, or Filthy People. This term has been bestowed upon the vagrant Irish by the Gipsies, from the dirty ways attributed to them. . . . . The trade they ostensibly drive is tinkering, repairing old kettles, and making little pots and pans of tin. The one, however, on which they principally depend, is not tinkering, but one far more lucrative, and requiring more cleverness and dexterity; they make false rings, like the Gipsy smiths" (p. 269). "Each of these *Hindity-mengre* has his blow-pipe, and some of them can execute their work in a style little inferior to that of a first-rate working goldsmith" (p. 270).

* Mixed Gipsies tell no lies, when they say that they are not Gipsies; for, physiologically speaking, they are not Gipsies, but only partly Gipsies, as regards blood. In every other way they are Gipsies, that is, *chabos*, *calos*, or *chals* (Ed., p. 427).

Mr. Borrow does not venture to tell us who these Irish *Hindity-mengre* are, but he says:—

"The *Chorodies* are the legitimate [why the *legitimate?*] descendants of the rogues and outcasts who roamed about England long [how long?] before its soil was trodden by a Gipsy foot" (p. 267); and that the *Kora-mengre* "seem to be of much the same origin as the *Chorodies*" (p. 268).

It would be interesting to know why he so arbitrarily pitched upon their descent from people having an existence *long before* the Gipsies entered the country. He describes them as

"Strange, wild guests . . . . who, without being Gipsies, have much of Gipsyism in their habits, and who far exceed the Gipsies in number" (p. 266); "Gipsies, or gentry whose habits very much resemble those of Gipsies" (p. 278); and "vagrant people, less of Gipsies than those who call themselves travellers [the cant phrase for Gipsies *incog.*], and are denominated by the Gipsies *Chorodies*" (p. 280).

Here we have nothing but assertion, or rather mere supposition, and no trace of any investigation into the subject. As for English mixed Gipsies, whether settled or itinerant, he says nothing about them, as if they had no existence. He indeed incidentally alludes to two mixed marriages, that of the parents of Thomas Herne—the father being a Gipsy, and the mother a "Gentile of Oxford" (p. 157); and one of the Hernes married to at least a so-called "thorough-bred Englishman," whose "caravan, a rather stately affair, is splendidly furnished within" (p. 282). Nor does he account for the people mentioned living so exactly like Gipsies, and as being outwardly Gipsies in everything but their physical appearance.

We have seen that Mr. Borrow expressed his inability to account for what became of the Spanish Gipsies, when he alluded to the subject in the *Gipsies in Spain*, published in 1841. In the present work he refers to the same aspect of the question as it applies to the race in England. Thus he says:—

"The Gipsies call each other brother and sister, and are not in the habit of admitting to their fellowship people of a different blood, and with whom they have no sympathy" (p. 214). "The highly exclusive race of the Gipsies" (p. 216). "They have a double nomenclature, each tribe or family having a public and a private name; one by which they are known to the Gentiles, and another to themselves alone" (p. 225).

And yet he says of this very peculiar and exclusive people—so self-contained and so prolific in their nature, and so separated from the rest of the population by such a strong prejudice of caste as exists against them—that, by the mere change of life, brought about by the rural police preventing them camping out, and following the original Gipsy habits, "there is every reason to *suppose* that within a few years the English Gipsy caste will have disappeared, merged in the dregs of the English population" (p. 222). In point of *fact*, they *cannot avoid being Gipsies*, settled or unsettled, honest or dishonest, and will "merge" part of the *common English blood among them*, as the tribe in the British Islands and Western Europe have to a very great extent done already, as illustrated by what Mr. Borrow himself found at Yetholm. "Gipsyism is declining, and its days are numbered" (p. 220). He said that more than thirty years ago. As for the Gipsies "declining," "becoming extinct," or "ceasing to be Gipsies," by a change of habits, there is as much discrimination and reason in the assertion or supposition, as would be implied in the opinion of the farmers' chickens, that there are few or no Gipsies in the country for the reason that the hen-roosts have not been troubled as of old.

"True Gipsyism consists in wan-

dering about, in preying upon the Gentiles, but not living amongst them" (p. 221). That is its original condition, no doubt. The power of the rural police must be in its nature limited: it does not extend over the tribe in towns, or in the country when it does not trespass on private property, or encumber the roads; nor could the force otherwise legally interfere with the tribe unless when it engaged in actions forbidden to it, in common with the rest of the population. Mr. Borrow has at various times given expression to a number of amazingly crude remarks on this subject. Did he never meet with Gipsies who did not live in the old fashion? and did he not find them Gipsies as much as those following the original habits? It has often been a subject of reflection to me, why people should have taken a view of this subject so diametrically opposed to the facts of it, and without in any way investigating it.*

The strangest phenomenon connected with the Gipsies is, in some respects, Mr. Borrow himself. Here has he been "a-sweeping" the Gipsy chimney for the last thirty odd years, and has not got further in the job than sticking in the vent, and preventing it drawing, or being swept by others. And heaven knows that *that* chimney wants cleaning badly. As to the so-called disappearance of the Gipsies, I could not look upon what he says as his real opinions, were it not for his inconsistent and illogical ideas about other matters connected with their history. Even to the last he sticks to his old opinion regarding the disappearance of the tribe by intermarriage, in the face of the greatly-mixed breeds he found at Yetholm, some of whom he described, as we have already seen, "as neither the children nor the grand-children of real Gipsies, but only the remote descendants," "in whom a few drops of Gipsy blood were mixed with some Scottish and a much larger quantity of low Irish"* (p. 328). And that throws a great light upon all he said about the three

* A Gipsy, of some property, who gave one of her sons a good education, declared that the young man was entirely spoiled (p. 364). It is well to notice the fact, that by giving a Gipsy child a good education, it became "entirely spoiled." It would be well if we could "spoil" all the Gipsies. A thoroughly-spoiled Gipsy makes a very good man, but leaves him a Gipsy notwithstanding. A "thorough Gipsy" has two meanings; one strongly attached to the tribe, and its *original habits*, or one without these original habits. There are a good many "spoiled" Gipsies, male and female, in Scotland (Ed., p. 364).

* The Rev. John Baird, the Minister of Yetholm, in his first missionary report in 1840, when he had thirty-eight Gipsy children attending his school, mentions that a few of the Gipsy population there "possess fair complexions, and some of them even red hair," so that a "stranger, entering their dwellings, would never for one moment regard them as real Gipsies." "However, this is true of much the smaller proportion. . . . . The present race are little more than half caste."

The woman Mr. Borrow first addressed, said of this Gipsy colony, that "they are far less Gipsy than Irish, a great deal of Irish being mixed in their veins with a very little of the much more respectable Gipsy blood" (p. 311). This idea is doubtless an assumption, so far as it applies to *common* Irish blood as imported, although it may apply to Irish blood gipsified in Ireland before it found its way into Scotland. In the *History of the Gipsies*, we find the following:—

"Almost all the Scottish Gipsies assert that their ancestors came by way of Ireland into Scotland.

"[This is extremely likely. On the publication of the edict of Ferdinand of Spain, in 1492, some of the Spanish Gipsies would likely pass over to the South of Ireland, and thence find their way into Scotland before 1506. Anthonius Gawino, above referred to, would almost seem to be a Spanish name. We may, therefore, very safely assume that the Gipsies of Scotland are of Spanish Gipsy descent (Ed., p. 98)]."

The Yetholm Gipsies may even have called themselves Irish, when that would have served a better purpose than to be known as Gipsies.

kinds of "travelling people" to be found in England, as described by him. They will deny that they belong to the tribe; so will the pure-blood or more original kind of Gipsies say the same of them. But there is no difficulty in the way of believing that they, or many, or most of them, "belong to the tribe," however remote the descent from the original Gipsies, even if they had only "a few words of Bastard Romany," or none at all for that matter, excepting, perhaps, a few catch or pass-words. For a full discussion of the whole subject, I refer the reader to the *History of the Gipsies*, and will add here the following extracts from it:—

In expatiating on the subject of the Gipsy race always being the Gipsy race, I have had it remarked to me:—"Suppose Gipsies should not mention to their children the fact of their being Gipsies?" In that case, I replied, the children, especially if, for the most part, of white blood, would simply not be Gipsies; they would, of course, have some of "the blood," but they would not be Gipsies if they had no knowledge of the fact. But to suppose that Gipsies should not learn that they are Gipsies, on account of their parents not telling them of it, is to presume that they had no other relatives. Their being Gipsies is constantly talked of among themselves; so that, if Gipsy children should not hear their "wonderful story" from their parents, they would readily enough hear it from their other relatives. This is assuming, however, that the Gipsy mind can act otherwise than the Gipsy mind; which it cannot.—It sometimes happens, as the Gipsies separate into classes, like all other races or communities of men, that a great deal of jealousy is stirred up in the minds of the poorer members of the tribe, on account of their being shunned by the wealthier kind. They are then apt to say that the exclusive members have *left* the tribe; which, with them, is an undefined and confused idea, at the best, principally on account of their limited powers of reflection, and the subject never being alluded to by the others. This jealousy sometimes leads them to dog these straggling sheep, so that, as far as lies in their power, they will not allow them to leave, as they imagine, the Gipsy fold (Ed., p. 413).

There is a point which I have not explained so fully as I might have done, and it is this:—"Is any of the blood *ever lost?* that is, does it *ever cease to be Gipsy*, in knowledge and feeling?" That is a question not easily answered in the affirmative, were it only for this reason: how can it ever be ascertained that the knowledge and feeling of being Gipsies become lost? Let us suppose that a couple of Gipsies leave England, and settle in America, and that they never come in contact with any of their race, and that their children never learn anything of the matter from any quarter. In such an extreme, I may say, such an unnatural case, the children would not be Gipsies, but, if born in America, ordinary Americans. The only way in which the Gipsy blood —that is, the Gipsy feeling—can possibly be lost, is by a Gipsy (a man especially) marrying an ordinary native, and the children never learning of the circumstance. But, as I have said before, how is that ever to be ascertained? The question might be settled in this way:—Let the relatives of the Gipsy interrogate the issue, and if it answers, *truly*, that it knows nothing of the Gipsy connexion, and never has its curiosity in the matter excited, it holds, beyond dispute, that "the blood" has been lost to the tribe. For any loss the tribe may sustain, in that way, it gains, in an ample degree, by drawing upon the blood of the native race, and transmuting it into that of its own fraternity (Ed., p. 532).

The subject of the Gipsies has hitherto been treated as a question of natural history only, in the same manner as we would treat ant-bears. Writers have sat down beside them, and looked at them—little more than looked at them —described some of their habits, and reported their *chaff*. To get to the bottom of the subject, it is necessary to sound the mind of the Gipsy, lay open and dissect his heart, identify one's self with his feelings and the bearings of his ideas, and construct, out of these, a system of mental science, based upon the mind of the Gipsy, and human nature generally. For it is the mind of the Gipsy that constitutes the Gipsy; that which, in reference to its singular origin

and history, is, in itself, indestructible, imperishable and immortal (Ed., p. 452).

What may be termed the philosophy of the Gipsies is very simple in itself, when we have before us its main points, its principles, its bearings, its genius; and fully appreciated the circumstances with which the people are surrounded. The most remarkable thing about the subject is, that people never should have dreamt of its nature, but, on the contrary, believed that "the Gipsies are gradually disappearing, and will soon become extinct." The Gipsies have always been disappearing, but where do they go to? Look at any tent of Gipsies, when the family are all together, and see how prolific they are. What, then, becomes of this increase? The present work answers the question. It is a subject, however, which I have found some difficulty in getting people to understand. One cannot see how a person can be a Gipsy, "because his father was a respectable man;" another, "because his father was an old soldier;" and another cannot see "how it necessarily follows that a person is a Gipsy, for the reason that his parents were Gipsies." The idea, as disconnected from the use of a tent, or following a certain kind of life, may be said to be strange to the world; and, on that account, is not very easily impressed on the human mind. It would be singular, however, if a Scotchman, after all that has been said, should not be able to understand what is meant by the Scottish Gipsy tribe, or that it should ever cease to be that tribe as it progresses in life. In considering the subject, he need not cast about for much to look at, for he should exercise his mind, rather than his eyes, when he approaches it. It is, principally, a mental phenomenon, and should, therefore, be judged of by the faculties of the mind: for a Gipsy may not differ a whit from an ordinary native, in external appearance or character, while, in his mind, he may be as thorough a Gipsy as one could well imagine.

In contemplating the subject of the Gipsies, we should have a regard for the facts of the question, and not be led by what we might, or might not, imagine of it. The race might, to a certain extent, be judged analogously, by what we know of other races; but that which is pre-eminently necessary, is to judge of it by facts: for facts, in a matter like this, take precedence of everything. Even in regard to the Gipsy language, broken as it is, people are very apt to say that it *cannot* exist at the present day; yet the least reflection will convince us, that the language which the Gipsies use is the remains of that which they brought with them into Europe, and not a make-up, to serve their purposes. The very genius peculiar to them, as an Oriental people, is a sufficient guarantee of this fact; and the more so from their having been so thoroughly separated, by the prejudice of caste, from others around them; which would so naturally lead them to use and retain their peculiar speech. But the use of the Gipsy language is not the only, not even the principal, means of maintaining a knowledge of being Gipsies; perhaps it is altogether unnecessary; for the mere consciousness of the fact of being Gipsies, transmitted from generation to generation, and made the basis of marriages, and the intimate associations of life, is, in itself, perfectly sufficient. The subject of two distinct races existing upon the same soil is not very familiar to the mind of a British subject. To acquire a knowledge of such a phenomenon, he should visit certain parts of Europe, or Asia, or Africa, or the New World. Since all (I may say all) Gipsies hide the knowledge of their being Gipsies from the other inhabitants, as they leave the tent, it cannot be said that any of them really deny themselves, even should they hide themselves from those of their own race. The ultimate test of a person being a Gipsy would be for another to catch the internal response of his mind to the question put to him as to the fact; or observe the workings of his heart in his contemplations of himself. It can hardly be said that any Gipsy denies, at heart, the fact of his being a Gipsy (which, indeed, is a contradiction in terms), let him disguise it from others as much as he may. If I could find such a man, he would be the only one of his race whom I would feel inclined to despise as such (Ed., p. 505).

In investigating this subject, I would formulate the inquiry under the following heads:—

1st. What constitutes a Gipsy in a settled or unsettled state?

2d. What should we ask a Gipsy

to do to "cease to be a Gipsy," and become more a native of the country of his birth than he is already?

3d. In what relation does the race stand to others around it, with reference to intermarriage and the destiny of the mixed progeny, and that of the tribe generally?

An investigation of this kind would involve a search for so many facts, however difficult of being found; and should be conducted as I have stated of snakes swallowing their young, that is, "as a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions, or theories [or analogies] not being allowed to form part of the testimony" (p. 28).

As I do not anticipate having another opportunity to say anything on the subject of the Gipsies, I avail myself of this one to give a few more extracts from the *History*, as illustrative of some of their peculiarities, and of the relation existing between them and those among whom they live. The first extracts describe how a Gipsy is reared, which is the most important point connected with their history.

And how does the Gipsy woman bring up her children in regard to her race? She tells them her "wonderful story"—informs them who they are, and of the dreadful prejudice that exists against them, simply for being Gipsies. She then tells them about Pharaoh and Joseph in Egypt, terming her people "Pharaoh's folk." In short, she dazzles the imagination of the children, from the moment they can comprehend the simplest idea. Then she teaches them her words, or language, as the "real Egyptian," and frightens and bewilders the youthful mind by telling them that they are subject to be hanged if they are known to be Gipsies, or to speak these words, or will be looked upon as wild beasts by those around them. She then informs the children how long the Gipsies have been in the country; how they lived in tents; how they were persecuted, banished, and hanged, merely for being Gipsies. She then tells them of her people being in every part of the world, whom they can recognize by the language and signs which she is teaching them; and that her race will everywhere be ready to shed their blood for them. She then dilates upon the benefits that arise from being a Gipsy—benefits negative as well as positive; for should they ever be set upon—garroted, for example—all they will have to do will be to cry out some such expression as "*Bienératé, calo, chabo*" (goodnight, Gipsy, or black fellow), when, if there is a Gipsy near them, he will protect them. The children will be fondled by her relatives, handed about and hugged as "little ducks of Gipsies." The granny, while sitting at the fireside, like a witch, performs no small part in the education of the children, making them fairly dance with excitement. In this manner do the children of Gipsies have the Gipsy soul literally breathed into them.

In such a way—what with the supreme influence which the mother has exercised over the mind of the child from its very infancy; the manner in which its imagination has been dazzled; and the dreadful prejudice towards the Gipsies, which they all apply, directly or indirectly, to themselves—does the Gipsy adhere to his race. What with the blood, the education, the words, and the signs, they are simply Gipsies, and will be such as long as they retain a consciousness of who they are, and any peculiarities exclusively Gipsy (Ed., p. 379).

Imagine, then, a person taught from his infancy to understand that he is a Gipsy; that his blood (at least part of it) is Gipsy; that he has been instructed in the language and initiated in all the mysteries of the Gipsies; that his relations and acquaintances in the tribe have undergone the same experience; that the utmost reserve towards those who are not Gipsies has been continually inculcated upon him, and as often practised before his eyes; and what must be the leading idea, in that person's mind, but that he is a Gipsy? His pedigree is Gipsy, his mind has been cast in a Gipsy mould, and he can no more "cease to be a Gipsy" than perform any other impossibility in nature (Ed., p. 457).

It is even unnecessary to inquire, particularly, how that has been accomplished, for it is self-evident that the process which has linked other races to their ancestry, has doubly linked the Gipsy

race to theirs. Indeed, the idea of being Gipsies never can leave the Gipsy race. A Gipsy's life is like a continual conspiracy towards the rest of the world; he has always a secret upon his mind; and, from his childhood to his old age, he is so placed as if he were, in a negative sense, engaged in some gunpowder plot, or as if he had committed a crime, let his character be as good as it possibly may. Into whatever company he may enter, he naturally remarks to himself, "I wonder if there are any of us here." That is the position which the mixed and better kind of Gipsy occupies, generally and passively. Of course, there are some of the race who are always actually hatching some plot or other against the rest of the world (Ed., p. 453).

The next extracts explain the effect of the prejudice that exists against the Gipsies:—

It appears to me that the more their blood gets mixed with that of the ordinary natives, and the more they approach to civilization, the more determinedly will they conceal every particular relative to their tribe, to prevent their neighbours ascertaining their origin and nationality. The slightest taunting allusion to the forefathers of half-civilized Scottish Tinklers kindles up in their breasts a storm of wrath and fury: for they are extremely sensitive to the feeling which is entertained toward their tribe by the other inhabitants of the country. "I have," said one of them to me, "wrought all my life in a shop with fellow-tradesmen, and not one of them ever discovered that I knew a single Gipsy word." A Gipsy woman also informed me that herself and sister had nearly lost their lives on account of their language. The following are the particulars:—The two sisters chanced to be in a public-house near Alloa, when a number of colliers, belonging to the coal-works at Sauchie, were present. The one sister, in a low tone of voice, and in the Gipsy language, desired the other, among other things, to make ready some broth for their repast. The colliers took hold of the two Gipsy words *shaucha* and *blawkie*, which signify broth and pot; thinking the Tinkler women were calling them *Sauchie Blackies*, in derision and contempt of their dark, subterraneous calling. The consequence was, that the savage colliers attacked the innocent Tinklers, calling out that they would "grind them to powder," for calling them *Sauchie Blackies*. But the determined Gipsies would rather perish than explain the meaning of the words in English, to appease the enraged colliers; "for," said they, "it would have exposed our tribe, and made ourselves odious to the world." The two defenceless females might have been murdered by their brutal assailants, had not the master of the house fortunately come to their assistance (p. 283).

She stated that the public would look upon her with horror and contempt, were it known she could speak the Gipsy language (p. 285).

On the whole, however, our Scottish peasantry, in some districts, do not greatly despise the Tinklers; at least not to the same extent as the inhabitants of some other countries seem to do. When not involved in quarrels with the Gipsies, our country people, with the exception of a considerable portion of the land-owners, were, and are even yet, rather fond of the *superior* families of the *nomadic* class of these people, than otherwise (p. 284).

This opinion is confirmed by the fact that the Gipsies whom the Rev. Mr. Crabbe has civilized will not now be seen among the others of the tribe, at his annual festival at Southampton. We have already seen, under the head of Continental Gipsies, that "those who are gold-washers in Transylvania and the Banat, have no intercourse with others of their nation; nor do they like to be called Gipsies" (p. 283).

The prejudice of their fellow-creatures is a sufficiently potent cause in itself to preserve the identity of the Gipsy tribe in the world. It has made it to resemble an essence, hermetically sealed. Keep it in that position, and it retains its inherent qualities undiminished; but uncork the vessel containing it, and it might (I do not say it *would*) evaporate among the surrounding elements (Ed., p. 534).

Then we have the way in which the race gradually leave the tent—the hive from which they swarm—and acquire general itinerant or settled habits.

The primitive, original state of the

Gipsies is the tent and tilted cart. But as any country can support only a limited number in that way, and as the increase of the body is very large, it follows that they must cast about to make a living in some other way, however bitter the pill may be which they have to swallow. The nomadic Gipsy portion resembles, in that respect, a water trough; for the water which runs into it, there must be a corresponding quantity running over it. The Gipsies who leave the tent resemble the youth of our small seaports and villages; for there, society is so limited as to compel such youth to take to the sea or towns, or go abroad, to gain that livelihood which the neighbourhood in which they have been reared denies to them. In the same manner do these Gipsies look back to the tent from which they, or their fathers, have sprung. They carry the language, the associations, and the sympathies of their race, and their peculiar feelings toward the community, with them; and as residents of towns have generally greater facilities, from others of their race residing near them, for perpetuating their language, than when strolling over the country (Ed., p. 10).—Still, they will deny that they are Gipsies, and will rather almost perish than let any one, not of their own race, know that they speak their language in their own households and among their own kindred. They will even deny, or at least hide it from many of their own race (Ed., p. 12).—But it is in large towns they feel more at home. They then form little communities among themselves; and by closely associating and sometimes huddling together, they can more easily perpetuate their language, as I have already said, than by straggling twos or threes through the country. But their quarrelsome disposition frequently throws an obstacle in the way of such associations. Secret as they have been in keeping their language from even being heard by the public while wanderers, they are much more so since they have settled in towns (Ed., p. 13).

I further inquired of her how many of her tribe were in Scotland. Her answer was, "There are several thousand; and there are many respectable shopkeepers and householders in Scotland that are Gipsies." It was evident from this woman's manner, that she knew much she would not communicate (p. 297).—These innkeepers and stone-ware merchants are scarcely to be distinguished as Gipsies: yet they all retain the language, and converse in it among themselves. The females, as is their custom, are particularly active in managing the affairs of their respective concerns (p. 347).

The love which the Gipsies have for their language is described as follows:—

It is certain that a Gipsy can be a good man, as the world goes, nay, a very good man, and glory in being a Gipsy, but not to the public. He will adhere to his ancient language, and talk it in his own family; and he has as much right to do so, as, for example, a Highlander has to speak Gaelic in the Lowlands, or when he goes abroad, and teach it to his children. And he takes a greater pride in doing it, for thus he reasons:—"What is English, French, Gaelic, or any other living language compared to mine? Mine will carry me through every part of the known world; wherever a man is to be found, there is my language spoken. I will find a brother in every part of the world on which I may set my foot; I will be welcomed and passed along wherever I may go. Freemasonry indeed! what is Masonry compared to the brotherhood of the Gipsies? A language—a whole language—is its password. I almost worship the idea of being a member of a society into which I am initiated by my blood and language. I would not be a man if I did not love my kindred, and cherish in my heart that peculiarity of my race [its language] which casts a halo of glory around it, and makes it the wonder of the world!" (Ed., p. 12.)

For, besides the dazzling hold which the Gipsy language takes of the mind of a Gipsy, as the language of those black, mysterious heroes from whom he is descended, the keeping of it up forms the foundation of that self-respect which a Gipsy has for himself, amidst the prejudice of the world; from which, at the bottom of his heart, whatever his position in life, or character, or associations, may be, he considers himself separated (Ed., p. 408). They pique themselves on their descent, and on being in possession of secrets which are peculiarly and exclusively theirs, and which they imagine no other knows, or will ever

know. They feel that they are part and parcel of those mysterious beings who are an enigma to others, no less than to themselves (Ed., p. 402).

They are also anxious to retain their language, as a secret among themselves, for the use which it is to them in conducting business in markets or other places of public resort. But they are very chary of the manner in which they employ it on such occasions. Besides this, they display all the pride and vanity in possessing the language which is common with linguists generally (p. 284).

It is beyond doubt that the Gipsy language in Great Britain is broken, but not so broken as to consist of words only; it consists, rather, of expressions, or pieces, which are tacked together by native words—generally small words—which are lost to the ordinary ear, when used in conversation. In that respect, the use of Gipsy may be compared to the revolutions of a wheel: we know that the wheel has spokes, but, in its velocity, we cannot distinguish the colour or material of each individual spoke; it is only when it stands still that that can be done. In the same manner, when we come to examine into the British Gipsy language, we perceive its broken nature. But it still serves the purpose of a speech. Let any one sit among English Gipsies, in America, and hear them converse, and he cannot pick up an idea, and hardly a word which they say. "I have always thought Dutch bad enough," said an Irishman, who has often heard English Gipsies, in the State of New Jersey, speak among themselves; "but Gipsy is perfect gibble-gabble, like ducks and geese, for anything I can make of it" (Ed., p. 432).

Had a German listened a whole day to a Gipsy conversation, he would not have understood a single expression.—*Grellmann.*

The dialect of the English Gipsies, though mixed with English, is tolerably pure, from the fact of its being intelligible to the race in the centre of Russia. —*Borrow* (Ed., p. 298).*

How the Gipsies are taught their language is thus explained:—

Their speech appears to be copious, for, said he, they have a great many words and expressions for one thing. He further stated that the Gipsy language has no alphabet, or character, by which it can be learned, or its grammatical construction ascertained. He never saw any of it written. I observed to him that it would, in course of time, be lost. He replied, that "so long as there existed two Gipsies in Scotland, it would never be lost." It was further stated to me, by this family, that the Gipsies are at great pains in teaching their children, from their very infancy, their own language; and that they embrace every opportunity, when by themselves, of conversing in it, about their ordinary affairs (p. 316).

I observed to this woman that her language would, in course of time, be lost. She replied, with great seriousness, "It will never be forgotten, sir; it is in our hearts, and as long as a single Tinkler exists, it will be remembered" (p. 297).

"Yes," replied Ruthven, "I am a Gipsy, and a desperate, murdering race we are. I will let you hear me speak our language, but what the better will you be of that?" She accordingly uttered a few sentences, and then said, "Now, are you any the wiser for what you have heard? But that infant," pointing to her child of about five years of age, "understands every word I speak." "I know," continued the Tinkler, "that the public are trying to find out the secrets of the Gipsies, but it is in vain." This woman further stated that her tribe would be exceedingly displeased, were it known that any of their fraternity taught their language to

* I shall only observe, that the way in which the Gipsy language has been corrupted is this:—That whenever the Gipsies find words not understood by the people among whom they travel, they commit such to memory, and use them in their conversation, for the purpose of concealment. In the Lowlands of Scotland, for example, they make use of Gaelic, Welsh, Irish, and French words. These picked-up words and terms have, in the end, become part of their own peculiar tongue; yet some of the Gipsies are able to point out a number of these foreign words, as distinguished from their own. In this manner do the Gipsies carry along with them part of the language of every country through which they pass (p. 338).

"strangers." She also mentioned that the Gipsies believe that the laws which were enacted for their extirpation were yet in full force against them. I may mention, however, that she could put confidence in the family in whose house she made these confessions * (p. 294).

At first, he appeared much alarmed, and seemed to think I had a design to do him harm. His fears, however, were in a short while calmed; and, after much reluctance, he gave me the following words and expressions, with the corresponding English significations. Like a true Gipsy, the first expression which he uttered, as if it came the readiest to him, was, "*Choar a chauvie*"—(rob that person)—which he pronounced with a smile on his countenance (p. 295). He stated to me that, at the present day, the Gipsies in Scotland, when by themselves, transact their business in their own language, and hold all their ordinary conversations in the same speech. In the course of a few minutes, Steedman's fears returned upon him. He appeared to regret what he had done. He now said he had forgotten the language, and referred me to his father, old Andrew Steedman, who, he said, would give me every information I might require. I imprudently sent him out, to bring the old man to me; for, when both returned, all further communication, with regard to their speech, was at an end. Both were now dead silent on the subject, denied all knowledge of the Gipsy language, and were evidently under great alarm. The old man would not face me at all; and when I went to him, he appeared to be shaking and trembling, while he stood at the head of his horses, in his own stable. Young Steedman entreated me to tell no one that he had given me any words, as the Tinklers, he said, would be exceedingly displeased with him for doing so. This man, however, by being kindly treated, and seeing no intention of doing him any harm, became, at an after period, communicative, on various subjects relative to the Gipsies * (p. 296).

This man conducted himself very politely, his behaviour being very correct and becoming; and he seemed much pleased at being noticed, and kindly treated. At first, he spoke wholly in the Gipsy language, thinking that I was as well acquainted with it as himself. But when he found that I knew only a few words of it, he, like all his tribe, stopped in his communications, and, in this instance, began to quiz and laugh at my ignorance. On returning to the street, I repeated some of the words to one of the females. She laughed, and, with much good humour, said, "You will put me out, by speaking to me in that language" (p. 329).

This is the way in which the Gipsies resent the curiosity of others in regard to their language:—

During the following summer, a brother and a cousin of these girls called at my house, selling baskets. The one was about twenty-one, the other fifteen, years of age. I happened to be from home, but one of my family, suspecting them to be Gipsies, invited them into the house, and mentioned to them (although very incorrectly), that I understood every word of their speech. "So I saw," replied the eldest lad, "for when he passed us on the road, some some time ago, I called, in our language, to my neighbour, to come out of the way, and he understood what I said, for he immediately turned round and looked at us." At this moment, one of my daughters, about seven years of age, repeated, in their hearing, the Gipsy word for pot, having picked it up from hearing me mention it. The young Tinklers now thought they were in the midst of a Gipsy family, and seemed quite happy. "But are *you* really a *Nawken?*" I asked the eldest of them. "Yes, sir," he replied; "and to show you I am no impostor, I will give you the names of everything in your house;" which, in the presence of my family, he did, to the extent I asked of him. "My speech," he continued, "is not the cant of packmen, nor the slang of common thieves" (p. 302). Without entering into any preliminary conversation, for the purpose of smoothing the way for more direct questions, I took him into

* The Gipsies are always afraid to say what they would do in such cases. Perhaps they don't know, but have only a general impression that the individual would "catch it;" or there may be some old law on the subject. What Ruthven said of her's being a desperate race is true enough, and murderous too, among themselves, as distinguished from the inhabitants generally. Her remark was evidently part of that *frightening* policy which keeps the natives from molesting the tribe (Ed., p. 294).

my parlour, and at once inquired if he *could* speak the Tinkler language? He applied to my question the construction that I doubted if he could, and the consequences which that would imply, and answered firmly, "Yes, sir; I have been bred in that line all my life." "Will you allow me," said I, "to write down your words?" "O yes, sir; you are welcome to as many as you please." "Have you names for everything, and can you converse on any subject, in that language?" "Yes, sir; we can converse, and have a name for everything, in our own speech" (p.304). Like the Gipsy woman with whom I had no less than seven years' trouble ere getting any of her speech, this Gipsy lad became, in about an hour's time, very restless, and impatient to be gone. The true state of things, in this instance, dawned upon his mind. He now became much alarmed, and would neither allow me to write down his songs, nor stop to give me any more of his words and sentences. His terror was only exceeded by his mortification; and on parting with me, he said that, had he at first been aware I was unacquainted with his speech, he would not have given me a word of it (p. 306).

Like the Gipsy chief, in presence of Dr. Bright, at Csurgo, in Hungary, she in a short time became impatient; and, apparently when a certain hour arrived, she insisted upon being allowed to depart. She would not submit to be questioned any longer (p. 298).

This family, like all their race, now became much alarmed at their communications; and it required considerable trouble on my part to allay their fears. The old man was in the greatest anguish of mind at having committed himself at all relative to his speech. I was very sorry for his distress, and renewed my promise not to publish his name, or place of residence, assuring him he had nothing to fear (p. 317).

When I inquired of the eldest girl the English of *Jucal*, she did not, at first, catch the sound of the word; but her little sister looked up in her face and said to her, "Don't you hear? That is dog. It is dog he means." The other then added, with a downcast look, and a melancholy tone of voice, "You gentlemen understand all languages now-a-days" (p. 293).

A gentleman, an acquaintance of mine, was in my presence while the children were answering my words; and as the subject of their language was new to him, I made some remarks to him in their hearing, relative to their tribe, which greatly displeased them. One of the boys called out to me, with much bitterness of expression, "You are a Gipsy yourself, sir, or you never could have got these words" (p. 293).

It is a thing well-nigh impossible, to get a respectable Scottish Gipsy to acknowledge even a word of the Gipsy language. On meeting with a respectable—Scotchman, I will call him—in a company, lately, I was asked by him, "Are ye a' Tinklers?" "We're travellers," I replied. "But who is he?" he continued, pointing to my acquaintance. Going up to him, I whispered, "His *dade* is a *baurie grye-femler*" (his father is a great horse-dealer); and he made for the door, as if a bee had got into his ear. But he came back; oh, yes, he came back. There was a mysterious whispering of "pistols and coffee," at another time (Ed., p. 432).

Publish their language! Give to the world that which they had kept to themselves, with so much solicitude, so much tenacity, so much fidelity, for three hundred and fifty years! A parallel to such a phenomenon cannot be found within the whole range of history (p. 318).

Smith, in his *Hebrew People*, writes:—"The Jews had almost lost, in the *seventy* years' captivity, their original language; that was now become dead; and they spoke a jargon made up of their own language and that of the Chaldeans, and other nations with whom they had mingled. Formerly, preachers had only explained subjects; now, they were obliged to explain words; words which, in the sacred code, were become obsolete, equivocal, dead" (Ed., p. 318).

When we consider, on strictly philosophical principles, the phenomenon of the perpetuation of the Gipsy language, we will find that there is nothing so very wonderful about it after all. The race have always associated closely and exclusively together; and their language has become to them like the worship of a household god—hereditary, and is spoken among themselves under the severest of discipline (Ed., p. 24).

The following facts will explain the idea the Gipsies have of the universality of their race:—

A word upon the universality of the Gipsies. English Gipsies, on arriving in America, feel quite taken aback, on coming across a tent or wigwam of Indians. "Didn't you feel," said I to some of them, "very like a dog when he comes across another dog, a stranger to him?" And with a laugh, they said, "Exactly so." After looking awhile at the Indians, they will approach them, and "cast their sign, and salute them in Gipsy;" and if no response is made, they will pass on. They then come to learn who the Indians are. The same curiosity is excited among the Gipsies on meeting with the American farmer, on the banks of the Mississippi or Missouri; who, in travelling to market, in the summer, will, to save expenses, unyoke his horses, at mid-day or evening, at the edge of the forest, light his fire, and prepare his meal. What with the "kettle and tented wagon," the tall, lank, bony, and swarthy appearance of the farmer, the Gipsy will approach him, as he did the Indian; and pass on, when no response is made to his sign and salutation. Under such circumstances, the Gipsy would cast his sign, and give his salutation, whether on the banks of the Mississippi or the Ganges. Nay, a very respectable Scottish Gipsy boasted to me, that by his signs alone, he could push his way to the wall of China, and even through China itself. And there are doubtless Gipsies in China. Mr. Borrow says, that when he visited the tribe at Moscow, they supposed him to be one of their brothers, who, they said, were wandering about in Turkey, *China*, and other parts. It is very likely that Russian Gipsies have visited China, by the route taken by Russian traders, and met with Gipsies there.* But it tickles the Gipsy most, when it is insinuated, that if Sir John Franklin had been fortunate in his expedition, he would have found a Gipsy tinkering a kettle at the North Pole (Ed., p. 430).

The particulars of a meeting between English and American Gipsies are interesting. Some English Gipsies were endeavouring to sell some horses in Annapolis, in the State of Maryland, to what had the appearance of being respectable American farmers; who, however, spoke to each other in the Gipsy language, dropping a word now and then, such as "this is a good one," and so on. The English Gipsies felt amazed, and at last said, "What is that you are saying? Why, you are Gipsies!" Upon this, the Americans wheeled about, and left the spot as fast as they could. Had the English Gipsies taken after the Gipsy in their appearance, they would not have caused such a consternation to their American brethren, who showed much of "the blood" in their countenances; but as, from their blood being much mixed, they did not look like Gipsies, they gave the others a terrible fright, on their being found out. The English Gipsies said they felt disgusted at the others not acknowledging themselves. But I told them they ought rather to have felt proud of the Americans speaking Gipsy, as it was the prejudice of the world that led them to hide their nationality. On making inquiry in the neighbourhood, they found that these American Gipsies had been settled there since, at least, the time of their grandfather, and that they bore an English name (Ed., p. 431).

I accidentally got into conversation with an Irishman, in the city of New York, about secret societies, when he mentioned that he was a member of a great many such, indeed, "all of them," as he expressed it. I said there was one society of which he was not a member, when he began to enumerate them, and at last came to the Zincali. "What," said I, "are you a member of this society?" "Yes," said he; "the Zincali, or Gipsy." He then told me that there are many members of this society in the city of New York; not all members of it, under that name, but of its outposts, if I may so express it. The principal or Arch-gipsy for the city, he said, was a merchant, in —— street, who had in his possession a printed vocabulary or dictionary of the language, which was open only to the most thoroughly initiated. In the course of our conver-

* Bell, in an account of his journey to Pekin [1721], says that upwards of sixty Gipsies had arrived at Tobolsky, on their way to China, but were stopped by the Vice-governor, for want of passports. They had roamed, during the summer season, from Poland, in small parties, subsisting by selling trinkets, and telling fortunes (Ed., p. 430).

sation, it fell out that the native American Gipsy referred to at page 420 was one of the thoroughly initiated; which circumstance explained a question he had put to me, and which I evaded, by saying that I was not in the habit of telling tales out of school.

In Spain, as we have seen, a Gipsy taught her language to her son from a MS. I doubt not there are MS., if not printed, vocabularies of the Gipsy language among the tribe in Scotland, as well as in other countries (Ed., p. 438).

The destiny of the Gipsies is thus considered in the following extracts:—

What is to be the future of the Gipsy race? A reply to this question will be found in the history of it during the past, as described; for it resolves itself into two very simple matters of fact. In the first place, we have a foreign race, deemed by itself to be, as indeed it is, universal, introduced into Scotland, for example, taken root there, spread and flourished; a race that rests upon a basis the strongest imaginable. On the other hand, there is the prejudice of caste towards the name, which those bearing it escape only by assuming an incognito among their fellow-creatures. These two principles, acting upon beings possessing the feelings of men, will, of themselves, produce that state of things which will constitute the history of the Gipsies during all time coming, whatever may be the changes that may come over their character and condition. They may, in course of time, lose their language, as some of them, to a great extent, have done already; but they will always retain a consciousness of being Gipsies. The language may be lost, but their signs will remain, as well as so much of their speech as will serve the purpose of pass-words. "There is something there," said an English Gipsy of intelligence, smiting his breast; "there is something there which a Gipsy cannot explain." And, said a Scottish Gipsy, "It will never be forgotten"; as long as the world lasts, the Gipsies will be Gipsies." What idea can be more preposterous than that of saying, that a change of residence or occupation, or a little more or less of education or wealth, or a change of character or creed, can eradicate such feelings from the heart of a Gipsy; or that these circumstances can, by any human possibility, change his descent, his tribe, or the blood that is in his body? How can we imagine this race, arriving in Europe so lately as the fifteenth century, and in Scotland the century following, with an origin so distinct from the rest of the world, and so treated by the world, can possibly have lost a consciousness of nationality in its descent, in so short a time after arrival; or, that that can happen in the future, when there are so many circumstances surrounding it to keep alive a sense of its origin, and so much within it to preserve its identity in the history of the human family? Let the future history of the world be what it may, Gipsydom is immortal.—This sensation in the minds of the Gipsies, of the perpetuity of their race, creates, in a great measure, its immortality. Paradoxical as it may appear, the way to preserve the existence of a people is to scatter it, provided, however, that it is a race thoroughly distinct from others, to commence with. When, by the force of circumstances, it has fairly settled down into the idea that it is a people, those living in one country become conscious of its existence in others; and hence arises the principal cause of the perpetuity of its existence as a scattered people (Ed., p. 441).

It would be well for the reader to consider what a *Gipsy is*, irrespective of the *language which he speaks;* for the *race* comes *before* the *speech* which it uses. That will be done fully in my Disquisition on the Gipsies. The language, considered in itself, however interesting it may be, is a secondary consideration; it may ultimately disappear, while the people who now speak it will remain (Ed., p. 292).

Some Gipsies can, of course, speak Gipsy much better than others. It is most unlikely that the Scottish Gipsies, with the head, the pride, and the tenacity of native Scotch, would be the first to forget the Gipsy language. The sentiments of the people themselves are very emphatic on that head. "It will never be forgotten, sir; it is in our hearts, and, as long as a single Tinkler exists, it will be remembered" (p. 297). "So long as there existed two Gipsies in Scotland, it would never be lost" (p. 316). The English Gipsies admit that the language is more easily preserved in a settled life, but more useful to travelling and out-door Gipsies;

and that it is carefully kept up by both classes of Gipsies. This information agrees with our author's, in regard to the settled Scottish Gipsies. There is one very strong motive, among many, for the Gipsies keeping up their language, and that is, as I have already said, their self-respect. The best of them believe that it is altogether problematical how they would be received in society, were they to make an avowal of their being Gipsies, and lay bare the history of their race to the world. The prejudice that exists against the race, and against them, they imagine, were they known to be Gipsies, drives them back on that language which belongs exclusively to themselves; to say nothing of the dazzling hold which it takes of their imagination, as they arrive at years of reflection, and consider that the people speaking it have been transplanted from some other clime. The more intelligent the Gipsy, the more he thinks of his speech, and the more care he takes of it (Ed., p. 433).

The difference between the Gipsies of mixed blood and the ordinary natives of the country is thus illustrated:—

Besides the difference just drawn between the Gipsy and ordinary native—that of recognizing and being recognized by another Gipsy—I may mention the following general distinction between them. The ordinary Scot knows that he is a Scot, and nothing more, unless it be something about his ancestors of two or three generations. But the Gipsy's idea of Scotland goes back to a certain time, indefinite to him, as it may be, beyond which his race had no existence in the country. Where his ancestors sojourned, immediately, or at any time, before they entered Scotland, he cannot tell; but this much he knows of them, that they are neither Scottish nor European, but that they came from the East. The fact of his blood being mixed exercises little or no influence over his feelings relative to his tribe, for, mixed as it may be, he knows that he is one of the tribe, and that the origin of his tribe is his origin. In a word, he knows that he has sprung from the tent. Substitute the word Scotch for Moor, as related of the black African Gipsies, at page 429, and he may say of himself and tribe, "We are not Scotch, but can give no account of ourselves." * It is a little different, if the mixture of his blood is of such recent date as to connect him with native families; in that case, he has "various bloods" to contend for, should they be assailed; but his Gipsy blood, as a matter of course, takes precedence. By marrying into the tribe, the connexion with such native families gradually drops out of the memory of his descendants, and leaves the sensation of tribe exclusively Gipsy. Imagine, then, that the Gipsy has been reared a Gipsy, in the way so frequently described, and that he "knows all about the Gipsies," while the ordinary native knows really nothing about them; and we have a general idea of what a Scottish Gipsy is, as distinguished from an ordinary Scotchman. If we admit that every native Scot knows who he is, we may readily assume that every Scottish Gipsy knows who *he* is. But, to place the point of difference in a more striking light, it may be remarked, that the native Scot will instinctively exclaim, that "the present work has no earthly relation either to him or his folk;" while the Scottish Gipsy will as instinctively exclaim, "It's us, there's no mistake about it;" and will doubtless accept it, in the main, with a high degree of satisfaction, as the history of his race, and give it to his children as such (Ed., p. 461).

A respectable, indeed, any kind of, Scottish Gipsy does not contemplate his ancestors—the "Pilgrim Fathers," and "Pilgrim Mothers," too—as robbers, although he could do that with as much grace as any Highland or Border Scot, but as a singular people, who doubtless came from the Pyramids; and their language, as something about which he really does not know what to think; whether it is Egyptian, Sanscrit, or what it is. Still, he has part of it; he loves it; and no human power can tear it out of his heart. He knows that every intelligent being sticks to his own, and clings to his descent; and he considers it his highest pride to be an Egyptian—a descendant of those swarthy kings

* The tradition among the Scottish Gipsies of being Ethiopians, whatever weight the reader may attach to it, dates as far back, at least, as the year 1615; for it is mentioned in the remission under the privy seal, granted to William Auchterlony, of Cayrine, for resetting John Faa and his followers (Ed., p. 315).

and queens, princes and princesses, priests and priestesses, and, of course, thieves and thievesses, that, like an apparition, found their way into, and, after wandering about, settled down in, Scotland. Indeed, he never knew anything else than that he was an Egyptian; for it is in his blood; and, what is more, it is in his heart, so that he cannot forget it, unless he should lose his faculties and become an idiot; and then he would be an Egyptian idiot. How like a Gipsy it was for Mrs. Fall, of Dunbar, to "work in tapestry the principal events in the life of the founder of her family, from the day the Gipsy child came to Dunbar, in its mother's creel, until the same Gipsy child had become, by its own honourable exertions, the head of the first mercantile establishment then existing in Scotland" (Ed., p. 462).

The Scottish Gipsies, when their appearance has been modified by a mixture of the white blood, have possessed, in common with the Highlanders, the faculty of "getting out" of the original ways of their race, and becoming superior in character, notwithstanding the excessive prejudice that exists against the nation of which they hold themselves members. Except his strong partiality for his blood and tribe, language and signs, such a Gipsy becomes, in his general disposition and ways, like any ordinary native. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. Whenever a Gipsy, then, forsakes his original habits, and conforms with the ways of the other inhabitants, he becomes, for all practical purposes, an ordinary citizen of the Gipsy clan. If he is a man of good natural abilities, the original wild ambition of his race acquires a new turn; and his capacity fits him for any occupation. Priding himself on being an Egyptian, a member of this world-wide community, he acquires, as he gains information, a spirit of liberality of sentiment; he reads history, and perceives that every family of mankind has not only been barbarous, but very barbarous, at one time; and, from such reflections, he comes to consider his own origin, and very readily becomes confirmed in his early, but indistinct, ideas of his people, that they really are somebody. Indeed, he considers himself not only as good, but better than other people. His being forced to assume an incognito, and "keep as quiet as pussy," chafes his proud spirit, but it does not render him gloomy, for his natural disposition is too buoyant for that. How, then, does such a Scottish Gipsy feel in regard to his ancestors? He feels exactly as Highlanders do, in regard to theirs, or, as the Scottish Borderers do, with reference to the "Border Ruffians," as I have heard a Gipsy term them. Indeed, the gallows of Perth and Stirling, Carlisle and Jedburgh, could tell some fine tales of many respectable Scottish people, in times that are past (Ed., p. 462).

It is certainly a singular position which is occupied, from generation to generation, and century to century, by our settled Scottish, as well as other, Gipsies, who are not known to the world as such, yet maintain a daily intercourse with others not of their own tribe. It resembles a state of semi-damnation, with a drawn sword hanging over their heads, ready to fall upon them at any moment. But the matter cannot be mended. They are Gipsies, by every physical and mental necessity, and they accommodate themselves to their circumstances as they best may. This much is certain, that they have the utmost confidence in their incognito, as regards their descent, personal feelings, and exclusively private associations. The word "Gipsy," to be applied to them by strangers, frightens them, in contemplation, far more than it does the children of the ordinary natives; for they imagine it a dreadful thing to be known to their neighbours as Gipsies. Still they have never occupied any other position; they have been born in it, and reared in it; it has even been the nature of the race, from the very first, always to "work in the dark." In all probability, it has never occurred to them to imagine that it will ever be otherwise; nor do they evidently wish it; for they can see no possible way to have themselves acknowledged, by the world, as Gipsies. The very idea horrifies them. So far from letting the world know anything of them, as Gipsies, their constant care is to keep it in perpetual darkness on the subject. Of all men, these Gipsies may say:—

" . . . rather bear those ills we have,
Than fly to others that we know not of."

Indeed, the only thing that worries such a Gipsy is the idea that the public should know all about *him;* otherwise, he feels a supreme satisfaction in being a Gipsy; as well as in having such a

history of his race as I have informed him I proposed publishing, provided I do not in any way mix *him* up with it, or "let *him* out." By bringing up the body in the manner done in this work, by making a sweep of the whole tribe, the responsibility becomes spread over a large number of people; so that, should the Gipsy become, by any means, known, personally, to the world, he would have the satisfaction of knowing that he had others to keep him company; men occupying respectable positions in life, and respected, by the world at large, as individuals (Ed., p. 464).

The difference of feeling between the two races at the present day proceeds from positive ignorance on the part of the native towards the other; an ignorance in which the Gipsy would rather allow him to remain; for, let him turn himself in whatever direction he may, he imagines he sees, and perhaps does see, nothing but a dark mountain of prejudice existing between him and every other of his fellow-creatures. He would rather retain his incognito, and allow his race to go down to posterity shrouded in its present mystery (Ed., p. 426).—It necessarily follows, that the race must remain shrouded in its present mystery, unless some one, not of the race, should become acquainted with its history, and speak for it (Ed., p. 427).

In seeking for Gipsies among Scotch people, I know where to begin, but it puzzles me where to leave off. I would pay no regard to colour of hair or eyes, character, employment, position, or indeed any outward thing. The reader may say:—"It must be a difficult matter to detect such mixed and educated Gipsies as those spoken of." It is not only difficult, but outwardly impossible. Such Gipsies cannot even tell each other from their personal appearance; but they have signs, which they can use, if the others choose to respond to them (Ed., p. 428).

For all these reasons, the most appropriate word to apply to modern Gipsyism, and especially British Gipsyism, and more especially Scottish Gipsyism, is to call it a caste, and a kind of masonic society, rather than any particular mode of life. And it is necessary that this distinction should be kept in mind, otherwise the subject will appear contradictory (Ed., p. 12).

Consider, then, that the process which I have attempted to describe has been going on, more or less, for at least the last three hundred and fifty years; and I may well ask, where might we *not* expect to meet with Gipsies, in Scotland, at the present day? And I reply, that we will meet with them in every sphere of Scottish life, not excepting, perhaps, the very highest. There are Gipsies among the very best Edinburgh families. I am well acquainted with Scotchmen, youths and men of middle age, of education and character, and who follow very respectable occupations, that are Gipsies, and who admit that they are Gipsies. But, apart from my own knowledge, I ask, is it not a fact, that a few years ago a pillar of the Scottish Church, at Edinburgh, upon the occasion of founding a society for the reformation of the poor class of Scottish Gipsies, and frequently thereafter, said that he himself was a Gipsy? I ask, again, is not that a fact? It is a fact. And such a man! Such prayers! Such deep-toned, sonorous piety! Such candour! Such judgment! Such amiability of manners! How much respected! How worthy of respect! The good, the godly, the saintly doctor! When will we meet his like again?* (Ed. p. 405.)

The admission of the good man alluded to casts a flood of light upon the history of the Scottish Gipsy race, shrouded as it is from the eye of the general population; but the information given by him was apt to fall flat upon the ear of the ordinary native, unless it was accompanied by some such exposition of the subject as is given in this work. Still, we can gather from it, where Gipsies are to be found, what *a* Scottish Gipsy is, and what the race is capable of; and what might be expected of it, if the prejudice of their fellow-creatures was withdrawn from the race, as distinguished from the various classes into which it may be divided, or, I should rather say, the personal conduct

* "Grand was the repose of his lofty brow, dark eye, and aspect of soft and melancholy meaning. It was a face from which every evil and earthly passion seemed purged. A deep gravity lay upon his countenance, which had the solemnity, without the sternness, of one of our old reformers. You could almost fancy a halo completing its apostolic character." (Ed., p. 405.)

of each Gipsy individually. View the subject any way I may, I cannot resist coming to the conclusion that, under more favourable circumstances, it is difficult to say what the Gipsies might not attain to. But that would depend greatly upon the country in which they are to be found. Scotland has been peculiarly favourable for them in some respects (Ed., p. 415).

The prejudice that exists against the Gipsies has a three-fold effect—that bearing directly upon them, and, notwithstanding its depressing influence, the high opinion they have of themselves, and the result it has of making them "stick to each other."

The peculiar feeling that is entertained for what is popularly understood to be a Gipsy differs from that which is displayed toward the Negro, in that it attaches to his traditional character and mode of life alone. The general prejudice against the Negro is, to a certain extent, natural, and what any one can realize. If the European has a difficulty in appreciating the feeling which is exhibited by Americans against the African in their general intercourse of daily life, few Americans can realize the feeling which is entertained toward the tented Gipsy. Should such a Gipsy be permitted to enter the dwelling of a native, the most he will let him come in contact with will be the chair he will give him to sit on, and the dish and spoon out of which he will feed him, all of which can again be cleaned. His guest will never weary his patience, owing to the embodiment of restlessness which characterizes his race; nor will his feelings ever be tried by his asking him for a bed, for, what the herb commonly called catnip is to the animal somewhat corresponding to that word, a bundle of straw in an out-house is to the tented Gipsy (Ed., p, 54).

There is something singularly inconsistent in the mind of the Gipsies. They pride themselves, to an extraordinary degree, in their race and language; at the same time, they are extremely sensitive to the prejudice that exists against them. "We feel," say they, "that every other creature despises us, and would crush us out of existence, if it could be done. No doubt there are things which many of the Gipsies do not hold to be a shame that others do; but, on the other hand, they hold some things to be a shame which others do not. They have many good points. They are kind to their own people, and will feed and clothe them, if it is in their power; and they will not molest others who treat them civilly. They are somewhat like the wild American Indians: they even go so far as to despise their own people who will willingly conform to the ways of the people among whom they live, even to putting their heads under a roof. But, alas! a hard necessity renders it unavoidable; a necessity of two kinds—that of making a living under the circumstances in which they find themselves placed, and the impossibility of enforcing their laws among themselves. Let them do what they may, live as they may, believe what they may, they are looked upon as everything that is bad. Yet they are a people, an ancient and mysterious people, that have been scattered by the will of Providence over the whole earth." It is to escape this dreadful prejudice that all Gipsies, excepting those who avowedly live and profess themselves Gipsies, will hide their race, if they can, and particularly so in the case of those who fairly leave the tent, conform to the ordinary ways of society, and engage in any of its various callings. While being convoyed by the son of an English Gipsy, whose family I had been visiting, at their house, where I had heard them freely speak of themselves as Gipsies, and converse in Gipsy, I said, in quite a pleasant tone, "Ah, my little man, and you are a young Gipsy?—Eh, what's the matter?" "I don't wish to be known to the people as a Gipsy." His father, on another occasion, said, "We are not ashamed to say to a friend that we are Gipsies; but my children don't like people to be crying after them, 'Look at the Gipsies!'" And yet this family, like all Gipsies, were strongly attached to their race and language. It was pitiful to think that there was so much reason for them to make such a complaint. On one occasion, I was asked, "If you would not deem it presumptuous, might we ask you to take a bite with us?" "Eat with you? Why not?" I replied. "What will your people think, if they knew that you had been eating with us? You will lose caste." This was said in a serious manner, but slightly tinged with irony.

Bless me, I thought, are all our Scottish Gipsies, of high and low degree, afraid that the ordinary natives would not even eat with them, if they knew them to be Gipsies? (Ed., p. 362.)

These poor people were much alarmed when I let them see that I knew they were Gipsies. They thought I was despising them, and treating them with contempt; or they were afraid of being apprehended under the old sanguinary laws, condemning the whole unfortunate race to death; for the Gipsies, as I have already said, still believe that these bloody statutes are in full force against them at the present day* (p. 290).

The prejudice of their fellow-creatures, which clings to the race to which they belong, almost overwhelms some of them at times; but it is only momentary; for such is the independence and elasticity of their nature, that they rise from under it, as self-complacent and proud as ever. They in such cases resort to the *tu quoque*—the *tit for tat* argument as regards their enemies, and ask, "What is this white race, after all? What were their forefathers a few generations ago? the Highlands a nest of marauding thieves, and the Borders little better. Or society at the present day—what is it but a compound of deceit and hypocrisy? People say that the Gipsies steal. True; some of them steal chickens, vegetables, and such things; but what is that, compared to the robbery of widows and orphans, the lying and cheating of traders, the swindling, the robberies, the murders, the ignorance, the squalor, and the debaucheries of so many of the white race? What are all these, compared to the simple vices of the Gipsies? What is the ancestry they boast of, compared in point of antiquity to ours? People may despise the Gipsies, but they certainly despise all others not of their own race: the veriest beggar Gipsy, without shoes to his feet, considers himself better than the queen that sits upon the throne. People say that Gipsies are blackguards. Well, if some of them are blackguards, they are at least illustrious blackguards as regards descent, and so in fact; for they never rob each other, and far less do they rob or ruin those of their own family." And they conclude that the odium which clings to the race is but a prejudice (Ed., p. 11).

With regard to the general politics of the Scottish Gipsies, if they entertain any political sentiments at all, I am convinced they are monarchical; and that were any revolutionary convulsion to loosen the bonds of society, and separate the lower from the higher classes, they would take to the side of the superior portion of the community. They have, at all times, heartily despised the peasantry, and been disposed to treat menials with great contempt, though, at the very moment, they were begging at the doors of their masters. In the few instances which have come to my knowledge, of Scottish Gipsies forming matrimonial connexions with individuals of the community, those individuals were not of the working or lower classes of society (p. 366). Indeed, they were always much disposed to treat farm-servants with contempt, as quite their inferiors in the scale of society; and always boasted of their own high birth; and the antiquity of their family (p. 225).

What our author says of the politics

* Whatever may be the feeling on the part of the Gipsies, at the present day, in regard to the old Scottish laws, which never were repealed, the following note to the *History of the Gipsies* still holds good:—"It is interesting to notice the reason for this old Gipsy chief being so backward in giving our author some of his language. 'He was ashamed to do it.' Pity it is that there should be a man in Scotland, who, independent of personal character, should be ashamed of such a thing. Then, see how the Gipsy woman, in our author's house, said that 'the public would look upon her with horror and contempt, were it known she could speak the Gipsy language.' And again, the two female Gipsies, who would rather allow themselves to be murdered than give the meaning of two Gipsy words to Sauchie colliers, for the reason that 'it would have exposed their tribe, and made themselves odious to the world.' And all for knowing the Gipsy language!—which would be considered an accomplishment in another person! What frightful tyranny! Mr. Borrow, as we will by and by see, says a great deal about the law of Charles III., in regard to the prospects of the Spanish Gipsies. But there is a law above any legislative enactment—the law of society, of one's fellow-creatures—which bears so hard upon the Gipsies; the despotism of caste. If Gipsies, in such humble circumstances, are so afraid of being known to be Gipsies, we can form some idea of the morbid sensitiveness of those in a higher sphere of life" (Ed, p. 313).

of the Gipsies is rather more applicable to their ideas of their social position. Being a small body in comparison with the general population of the country, they entertain a very exclusive, and consequently a very aristocratic idea of themselves, whatever others may think of them; and therefore scorn the prejudice of the very lowest order of the common natives (Ed., p. 367).

Many of the Gipsies, following the various occupations enumerated, are not now to be distinguished from others of the community, except by the most minute observation; yet they appear a distinct and separate people; seldom contracting marriage out of their own tribe. A tradesman of Gipsy blood will sooner give his hand to a lady's maid of his own race, than marry the highest female in the land; while the Gipsy lady's maid will take a Gipsy shoemaker, in preference to any one out of her tribe. A Gipsy woman will far rather prefer, in marriage, a man of her own blood who has escaped the gallows, to the most industrious and best-behaved tradesman in the kingdom. Like the Jews, almost all those in good circumstances marry among themselves, and, I believe, employ their poorer brethren as servants. I have known Gipsies most solemnly declare, that no consideration would induce them to marry out of their own tribe; and I am informed, and convinced, that almost every one of them marries in that way. One of them stated to me that, let them be in whatever situation of life they may, they all "stick to each other" (p. 369).

In the *Disquisition on the Gipsies* I said that, "It is beyond doubt that there cannot be less than a quarter of a million of Gipsies in the British Isles, who are living under a grinding despotism of caste; a despotism so absolute and odious, that the people upon whom it bears cannot, as in Scotland, were it almost to save their lives, even say who they are!" (p. 440): and that, "This peculiar family of mankind has been fully three centuries and a half in the country, and it is high time that it should be acknowledged, in some form or other; high time, certainly, that we should know something about it" (p. 529). In dealing with a question like this, the main thing to be done is to establish a principle, such as will be explained in the following article on the *Social Emancipation of the Gipsies*. Here I will add some extracts from the *Disquisition on the Gipsies* on the improvement of the race generally.

As regards the improvement of the Gipsies, I would make the following suggestions:—The facts and principles of the present work should be thoroughly canvassed and imprinted on the public mind, and an effort made to bring, if possible, our high-class Gipsies to acknowledge themselves to be Gipsies. The fact of these Gipsies being received into society, and respected as Gipsies (as it is with them at present, as men), could not fail to have a wonderful effect upon many of the humble, ignorant, or wild ones. They would perceive, at once, that the objections which the community had to them proceeded, not from their being Gipsies, but from their habits only. What is the feeling which Gipsies, who are known to be Gipsies, have for the public at large? The white race, as a race, is simply odious to them, for they know well the dreadful prejudice which it bears towards them. But let some of their own race, however mixed the blood might be, be respected as Gipsies, and it would, in a great measure, break down, at least in feeling, the wall of caste which separates them from the community at large. This is the first, the most important, step to be taken to improve the Gipsies, whatever may be the class to which they belong. Let the prejudice be removed, and it is impossible to say what might not follow. Before attempting to reform the Gipsies, we ought to reform, or at least inform, mankind in regard to them; and endeavour to reconcile the world to them before we attempt to reconcile them to the world; and treat them as men before we try to make them Christians. The *poor* Gipsies know well that there are many of their race occupying respectable positions in life; perhaps they do not know many, or even any, of them personally, but they believe in it thoroughly. Still they will deny it, at least hide it from strangers, for this reason, among others, that it is a state to which their children, or even they themselves, look forward, as ultimately awaiting them, in which they

will manage to escape from the odium of their fellow-creatures, which clings to them in their present condition. The fact of the poor travelling Gipsies knowing of such respectable settled Gipsies, gives them a certain degree of respect in their own eyes, which leads them to repel any advance from the other race, let it come in almost whatever shape it may. The white race, as I have already said, is perfectly odious to them.* This is exactly the position of the question. The more original kind of Gipsies feel that the prejudice which exists against the race to which they belong is such, that an intercourse cannot be maintained between them and the other inhabitants; or, if it does exist, it is of so clandestine a nature, that their appearance, and, it may be, their general habits, do not allow or lead them to indulge in it. I will make a few more remarks on this subject further on in this treatise (Ed., p. 436).

The latter part of the Gipsy nation, whether settled or itinerant, must be reached indirectly, for reasons which have already been given; for it does not serve much purpose to interfere too directly with them, as Gipsies. We should bring a reflective influence to bear upon them, by holding up to their observation some of their own race in respectable positions in life, and respected by the world, as men, though not known to be Gipsies. For, in this way, the Gipsies, of all classes, would see that they are not outcasts; but that the prejudices which people entertain for them are applicable to their ways of life only, and not to their blood or descent, tribe or language. Their hearts would then become more easily touched, their affections more readily secured; and the attempt made to improve them would have a much better chance of being successful. A little judgment is necessary in conducting an intercourse with the wild Gipsy, or, indeed, any kind of Gipsy; it is very advisable to speak well of "the blood," and never to confound the race with the conduct of part of it. There is hardly anything that can give a poor Gipsy greater pleasure than to tell him something about his people, and par-

* People often reprobate the dislike, I may say the hatred, which the more original Gipsy entertains for society; forgetting that society itself has had the greatest share in the origin of it. When the race entered Europe, they are not presumed to have had any hatred towards their fellow-creatures. That hatred, doubtless, sprang from the severe reception and universal persecution which, owing to the singularity of their race and habits, they everywhere met with. The race then became born into that state of things. What would subsequent generations know of the origin of the feud? All that they knew was that the law made them outlaws and outcasts; that they were subject, as Gipsies, to be hung before they were born. Such a Gipsy might be compared to Pascal's man springing up out of an island: casting his eyes around him, he finds nothing but a legal and social proscription hanging over his head, in whatever direction he may turn. Whatever might be assumed to have been the original, innate disposition of a Gipsy, circumstances attending him, from his birth to his death, were certainly not calculated to improve him, but to make him much worse than he might otherwise have been. The worst that can be said of the Scottish Gipsies, in times past, has been stated by our author. With all their faults, we find a vein of genuine nobility of character running through all their actions, which is the more worthy of notice, considering that they were at war with society, and society at war with them. Not the least important feature is that of gratitude for kind and hospitable treatment. In that respect, a true Scottish Gipsy has always been as true as steel; and that is saying a great deal in his favour. I cannot agree with Mr. Borrow, when he says, that the Gipsies "travelled three thousand miles into Europe, *with hatred in their hearts towards the people among whom they settled.*" In none of the earliest laws passed against them is anything said of their being other than thieves, cheats, etc., etc. They seem to have been too politic to commit murder; moreover, it appears to have been foreign to their disposition to do aught but obtain a living in the most cunning manner they could. There is no necessary connexion between purloining one's property and hating one's person. As long as the Gipsies were not hardly dealt with, they could naturally have no actual hatred towards their fellow-creatures. Mr. Borrow attributes none of the spite and hatred of the race towards the community to the severity of the persecutions to which it was exposed, or to that hard feeling with which society has regarded it. These, and the example of the Spaniards, doubtless led the Gitanos to shed the blood of the ordinary natives (Ed., p. 433).

ticularly should they be in a respectable position in life, and be attached to their nation. It serves no great purpose to appear too serious with such a person, for that soon tires him. It is much better to keep him a little buoyant and cheerful, with anecdotes and stories, for that is his natural character; and to take advantage of occasional opportunities, to slip in advices that are to be of use to him. What is called long-facedness is entirely thrown away upon a Gipsy of this kind (Ed., p. 529).

It is the Christian who should be the most ready to take up and do justice to this subject; for he will find in it a very singular work of Providence—the most striking phenomenon in the history of man. In Europe, the race has existed, in an unacknowledged state, for a greater length of time than the Jews dwelt in Egypt. And it is time that it should be introduced to the family of mankind, in its aspect of historical development; embracing, as in Scotland, members ranging from what are popularly understood to be Gipsies, to those filling the first positions in Christian and social society (Ed., p. 532).

It is the Christian who should endeavour to have the prejudice against the name of Gipsy removed, so that every one of the race should freely own his blood to the other, and make it the basis of a kindly feeling, and a bond of brotherhood, all around the world (Ed., p. 534).

THE SCOTTISH CHURCHES AND THE SOCIAL EMANCIPATION OF THE GIPSIES.*

REVEREND SIR:—I take the liberty of referring you to the accompanying papers on the Gipsies, a subject that well merits the attention of the Church, inasmuch as to it has belonged, almost exclusively, since the introduction of Christianity, the mission of raising up humanity in the religious, moral, and social aspects of its nature. That being the case with regard to the mere *instruction* of mankind, it becomes a much greater claim upon the Church, to treat people as men, before attempting to make them Christians, which is so necessary to be done with the Gipsies; for the feeling that people in general entertain for them is not much better than that which is displayed for toads and snakes, or reptiles of some kind. And yet, the Gipsies are physically a fine race of men, and anything but dolts in apprehension or capacity; and, in their way, are very polite at all times, and especially when properly approached by other people.

This tribe appeared in Scotland not later than the year 1506. Its existence for generations thereafter has been so established by the records of tradition, and so many acts of the Scots' Parliament, that its introduction and long continuance in the country cannot be questioned. The subject, however, has of late years so greatly passed beyond the attention of the public, that some even doubt the existence of the race at all. The civil and political rights of individuals or corporations may be proscribed by lapse of time; but such cannot be said of a principle or of a people, so long as it can perpetuate its existence, whatever the form or aspect of its development.

The Gipsies entered Scotland in possession of a language totally distinct from the Scotch, one word of which they probably did not at first

* This, and what is said of John Bunyan and the Jews, formed a communication addressed to some of the Scottish clergy early in 1871.

understand. They arrived completely organized, in the form of tribes, provincial chieftains, and a king over all, with their hand against every man, and the hand of every man (at least in feeling) against them. In short, they were a robber tribe, which held in the highest estimation successful and undiscovered theft, practised, with some exceptions, on all outside of their own fraternity. They were not originally a part of the native population that separated from the community, during a social, religious or political convulsion, and adopted habits that made them outcasts from society, and afterwards regained their social standing among their own race, by resuming their original habits; but were a people differing nearly as much from the inhabitants of Scotland, as the Indians did from the colonists settling in America. They were thus not Gipsies in consequence of certain habits, so that a change of habits, or the acquisition of means, or education, or creed, could not change them from being Gipsies into some other family, tribe or race.

I have spoken of the singular feeling that is entertained for the Gipsies. In the face of that feeling, does it surprise you to be told that the race should hide everything connected with itself from others? It would be contrary to the simplest instincts of nature and all experience, should they have done otherwise; or that they should not "marry among themselves," like the Jews, and "stick to each other," whatever may be their positions in life. Hence, the tribe have so far succeeded in preventing other people from knowing almost anything connected with them, that their very existence as Gipsies is almost, if not altogether, doubted, if not denied.

A very natural question to ask is, Where have the Gipsies gone to? Has their fate been that of the lost ten tribes, which, it is generally admitted, is beyond the reach of investigation? How could that be predicated of a people of such recent introduction among civilized nations—that really belongs to contemporary history, and is to be found in existence among us today? How unreasonable it is to conclude that the tribe has ended in *nothing*, rather than by a careful examination and induction discover the real history of it! You thus see that the subject becomes one of disinterested and serious inquiry, in which there should be shown none of that apathy and contempt, and unreflecting incredulity, that is generally manifested, and is so unworthy of the age in which we live, and especially of men of education, and social and official standing in society.

Speak of civilized Gipsies, and even intelligent people become bewildered as to the meaning of the phrase, or rise in arms against the idea, and demand proof that there is, or even can be, such a phenomenon in existence as a civilized Gipsy. I, of course, appeal to the fact, in all its bearings, showing how it is a fact, and state, as a simple elementary truth, that the children or descendants of Gipsies are Gipsies, whatever their habits, character or position in life may be; leaving to the intuitive intelligence of others to realize the fact, as explained, and to their candour to acknowledge it. I might even turn upon such objectors, and ask them what they mean, when they speak of Gipsies of any kind, and what these or their descendants must do to divest themselves of the character of belonging to a tribe that is to be found everywhere, and become different from what, in regard to blood, feelings and associations, they really are. Indeed, a remark of that kind generally closes the door to all further questions or objections of that nature. I might also expatiate on the unreasonableness of people dogma-

tizing on a subject on which (as it may be) they know nothing personally, and can appeal to no one better informed on the point than themselves. I readily admit, in a general way, the truth of the adage, "out of sight, out of mind;" but I decidedly object to its being applied to the Gipsies to mean "out of sight, out of existence."

To the world at large, the subject of civilized Gipsies is a new idea (although an old fact), that is very apt to be objected to because it is a new idea, for the reason that people allege they do not understand it. But do people in every instance understand what all admit to be facts? Do they even understand what a Gipsy of the popular kind means? We in reality understand little of what we believe, and it has been well said, that if we believed only what we understood, we would all have remarkably short creeds. As people have believed in Gipsies of the popular kind without really understanding the subject, or giving it a serious thought, so might they believe in those more or less civilized, on the simple ground that they are the children or descendants of ordinary Gipsies, having their blood, an inherent sense of being members of the tribe, and some of the language and signs peculiar to themselves, like a Masonic society, although the possession of these words and signs is not absolutely necessary to constitute them Gipsies; for the mere consciousness of the fact of being Gipsies, transmitted from generation to generation, and made the basis of marriages and the intimate associations of life, is in itself perfectly sufficient. Hence, we can understand the meaning of Gipsy lady's maids, Gipsy fiddlers at parties, Gipsy spae-wives, and Gipsies in other spheres of life, mentioned by the author, whose facts, in the language of an American writer, are "so obviously derived from personal observation or conscientious inquiry, and so unaffectedly related," as to command belief; to say nothing of what I have added, in the way of facts and philosophy, establishing the perpetuation of the Gipsy nationality in a settled and civilized state.

You will thus see, as a result of the Gipsy nationality, forced as it has been to hide itself from the rest of the world, that a bond of sympathy exists between its members when they happen to meet, and that nothing can be more natural or credible. But, however natural or credible, we find the following singular comments on the subject in *All the Year Round*, for the 17th March, 1866:—

"Another craze, hitherto not general, but which, if believed in, will throw over society a delightful if slightly maddening amount of mystery, has been put forth in a certain book, written by a Scottish enthusiast, by which it appears that both Scotland and England are penetrated through and through with Gipsy blood, and that men and women whom we had all along taken for douce and honest Anglo-Saxons, or at the least Celts of the true breed, are nothing better than Gipsies." — "Our lady's maids may be Gipsies, with fair hair and blue eyes, 'chattering Gipsy' secretly to other 'romany managies,' likewise cunningly disguised. Soldiers and sailors may meet other 'Nawkens' or Gipsies like themselves in the enemy's camp, and cry, 'Zincali! zincali!' as at the discovery of a brother . . . but we do not believe it. Nothing is easier than to make up a mystery [?]. . . . It is all one to the mystery-monger, provided only he can weave his webs with the faintest show of reason."—"Once admit this base of secrecy, and you may build on it the most gigantic pyramid of marvel you choose."—"We may be excused if we somewhat doubt the accuracy of statements which cannot be proved by any modern methods known to us." [As if research and observation, and the satisfying ourselves as to facts, were not "modern methods known to us"! Or that one can doubt the "secrecy" that characterizes the Gipsies!]

We thus see how mere novelists

treat a question like the present. Their minds seem to be so besotted with fiction, as not, in a matter of this kind, to be capable of distinguishing between fact and fable. As a class, or almost invariably, they are anything but men of science or philosophy. With their tawdry sentimentality and improbable coincidence of circumstances, and all their "mystery-mongering," they cannot produce anything of lasting interest, that can approach facts, when found out of the beaten track, and seem jealous of them in consequence. A man of Dickens' standing might naturally have been supposed to become fired with the new ideas presented to him, so as to make them the subject of one of his powerful romances; but that would have been inconsistent with his genius, which preferred to stick to what people already admitted; so that he proved but "an ordinary personage" on the occasion, assuming that he was the writer of the article in question. Does the remark of Bunsen, in his *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, hold good, when he says:—

"Sound judgment is displayed rather in an aptness for believing what is historical, than in a readiness at denying it. . . . Shallow minds have a decided propensity to fall into the latter error." "Incapability of believing on evidence is the last form of the intellectual imbecility of an enervated age, and a warning sign of impending decay."*

In an article in *Blackwood's Magazine*, for May, 1866, it is said:—

"If an enterprising traveller gets starved to death in Australia, or frozen up at the North Pole, or eaten by the natives in Central Africa, at least he reaps the glory of the venture. But to penetrate into Gipsydom . . . offers no sort of honour or credit by way of reward."

The motive here presented rises no higher than the one described by Samuel Johnson, when he said, that such a one "would tumble in a pig-stye, if he could but get people to come and admire him." I admit that the subject of the Gipsies, so far as it is understood, and as *Blackwood* will have, or will allow, it to be understood, presents little interest to the world, if it means only *a certain style of life* that may *cease at any moment*. The reviewer absolutely ignores the allusions of the author to the Gipsies, in a greatly mixed state, as regards blood, and in a settled and civilized condition, and characterizes my additions to the work in the following terms:—

"But they [some of the facts and anecdotes] have unfortunately been mixed up on the editor's part with so much wild speculation, and so many unsupported assertions, which are made to pass for arguments."—"These accessories take up nearly half of the volume, which would be much more readable in every way if they had been omitted."

That is, if all I have added were represented by blank paper, literature and the world at large would have been gainers! That conservatism which might be termed Blackwoodism could go no further. How does this writer know that these additions are "wild speculations" and "unsupported assertions"? It never seems to have occurred to him that *his* additions to the subject are

* Mr. Leland, in his *English Gipsies*, writes:—"Mr. Dickens has set before us Cheap Jacks, and a number of men who were, in their very face, of the class of which I speak; but I cannot recall in his writings any indication that he knew that these men had a singular secret life with their *confréres*, or that they could speak a strange language; for we may well call that language strange which is, in the main, Sanscrit, with many Persian words intermingled. Mr. Dickens, however, did not pretend, as some have done, to specially treat of Gipsies, and he made no affectation of a knowledge of any mysteries. He simply reflected popular life as he saw it" (p. 5). Dickens' making no pretence of any knowledge of the Gipsies was a good reason why he should not have allowed the article in question to appear in *All the Year Round*.

"wild speculations" and "unsupported assertions," in all probability got up to meet a special order from the shop.

The fact is, the author had a grievance against the Blackwoods, and I have a letter from Blackwood the elder, stating that he will have his MS. searched for. In sending the MS. home for publication, I unfortunately omitted to say that it was *not* to be given to the Blackwoods; and, as bad luck would have it, it went straight to their shop. There it remained for nearly three years, the firm, so far as is known, acting the dog in the manger—that is, they would neither take it, nor allow it to be offered to another. A correspondence ensued, and a determination was come to to commence legal proceedings against them, which I presume were threatened, for the MS. very soon made its appearance, after I had given it up as lost, for the *fifth* time. Notwithstanding that, the article continues:—

"The book has a wandering history of its own. . . . *Even now it has been banished the realm, and shipped off to America* [!], and there at last it has found its way into print."

It was indeed a pity that it had not been altogether "burked." The younger Blackwoods seem to have conceived a spite for the work, arising, I presume, from their father and their magazine having been so much mixed up with it, in its inception and origin, of which they were doubtless ashamed, in the present popular feeling towards the subject. As for a civilized Gipsy, the magazine (on what authority does not appear) scoffs at the idea, and says, "Very few [it might have said none] can have realized it, as set forth in this book"—an interesting admission.

Space will not permit me to say much about the history of the Gipsies, as the blood becomes mixed with native. The question is very fully discussed in the work. The humblest native will tell you that he "would as soon take a toad to his bosom, as marry a tinkler." The consequence is, that when an amalgamation does take place, the progeny naturally and instinctively go with the "toad" and the toad's people; and if they are settled Gipsies, everything is kept a profound secret from the relations on the "other side of the house," and an absolute separation ensues if they are Gipsies of the old stock. You can thus see that the native element introduced *in detail* into the *body* of Gipsydom goes with that body, and *in feeling* becomes incorporated with it, although in physical appearance it so changes the Gipsy race, that it becomes "confounded with the residue of the population," but remains Gipsy as before; and that, instead of the Gipsies becoming lost among the native population, a certain part of the native blood becomes lost among them, adding greatly to the number of the body.

It would be unreasonable to say that a thing does not exist among the Esquimaux, because it is not to be found among the New Zealanders, or *vice versa*. Analogy has its use, no doubt; but everything must be settled on its own merits, although *Blackwood* seems to think otherwise, for in reference to the Gipsies becoming wedged in among native families, he says:—

"If your great-great-grandfather had the eccentric taste to marry a Hottentot, you have at least the comfort of thinking that by this time the cross must have pretty nearly disappeared."

What astonishes me the most, in connexion with the subject of the Gipsies, is, that writers, like the present one, should dogmatize so positively on what are in reality matters of fact of which they apparently know nothing; which can hardly be said of any other subject of which the mind takes cognizance. You might as well take some people

with a warrant, or dispossess them of their properties, as disturb them in their ideas, however ill-founded.*

In one of his articles in *Blackwood's Magazine*, the author, in reference to the more original kind of Gipsy, said :—

"What vexed me not a little was, when I put questions on the subject to sensible individuals, they generally burst out a-laughing, and asked me, 'Who would trouble themselves about tinklers?' Such is, and has been, the conduct and manners of the Gipsies, that the very word tinkler excites merriment whenever it is mentioned."

In Scotland to-day, most people are surprised when the word Gipsy is mentioned, and will ask, "Do you mean thae tinkler bodies? Wha would bother themselves wi' a wheen tinklers?" In the work, the author wrote :—

"The fact is, the Gipsies have hitherto been so completely despised, and held in such thorough contempt, that few ever thought of, or would venture to make inquiries of them relative to, their ancient customs and manners; and that, when any of their ceremonies were actually observed by the people at large, they were looked upon as the mere frolics, the unmeaning and extravagant practices of a race of beggarly thieves and vagabonds, unworthy of the slightest attention or credit."

The apathy and contempt, and unreflecting incredulity, here spoken of, naturally blind people to facts the most obvious and incontestable, and become, under Providence, a complete protection against any inquiry regarding the tribe, in the singular position which it occupies in the world. In the work, I have said :—

"As the Jews, during their pilgrimage in the Wilderness, were protected from their enemies by a cloud, so have the Gipsies, in their increase and development, been shielded from theirs by a mist of ignorance, which, it would seem, requires no little trouble to dispel."

I think I have said enough to create in your mind a curiosity and interest towards the subject of the Gipsies, and the more so by the many narrow escapes the MS. had from being lost, and the peculiar way the work is now brought under your notice. What, under Providence, may be its ultimate destiny in Scotland, will depend greatly upon those to whom this communication is addressed. There is to be encountered, in the first place, the prejudice (I will not call it the hostility) of centuries, that has become a feeling of caste—the most difficult thing to grapple with. Yet no one can be blamed for that feeling; it is but the result of preceding causes or circumstances. It has had this effect upon the tribe, that they are "ashamed" to let it be known that they are Gipsies, and (as it may be) can speak the language; and they think they "would become odious" to the world, and would be "looked on with horror and contempt," in consequence. The result is, that the subject has become like a substance hermetically sealed from the public, which retains its inherent qualities undiminished when kept in that position.

It is unfortunate that there should be such a feeling entertained for a people that have lived in Scotland for 365 years. It cannot be said that it is applied to other Gipsies than those of the old stock, for the question has never been tested. The organs of society do not seem to have noticed the subject, perhaps

* It is hardly necessary for me to point out the trifling fallacy in comparing the idea of being a member of the Gipsy tribe, that exists in Scotland and every other country, with that of a person having had a remote ancestor from one of the tropical countries visited by Scotchmen. And yet there is some of such blood in the country. So accustomed are people to be influenced by what is conventional only, that few could attach a meaning to the phrase "a Scotch Negro," while that of "American Negro" would pass current anywhere.

for the reason that they do not think the people will receive what they may say in regard to it. It is on that account I have addressed this letter to you, with the hope that you will consider it a duty, a privilege, and a pleasure, to do something in the way of diffusing a knowledge and creating an opinion on the subject, and a sympathy and respect for the people described. Your position in society is very influential, and the liberality of your education, particularly as regards logic and metaphysics, gives you a great advantage in drawing the distinctions necessary to be made, in investigating the subject treated. I do not mean that you should necessarily take any public or official notice of it, but that, as a private Christian gentleman, you should do your best, among your friends and neighbours, to bring about a change of ideas and feelings, in a quiet, genial, and gradual manner, as the ruder season passes into the more gentle, and as a purely social and moral movement should be made; just as Christianity itself, in its general principles, spread its benign influences over all that came within its reach. I intend sending this communication to all the Scotch clergy, and many people holding positions of trust and influence, as well as to the press; in short, to people who will not be apt to "laugh" at the subject, when they come to understand what it means, so that no hesitation need be shown in alluding to it in society. What is wanted, is to "make a beginning," and it will happen, as in most matters, that difficulties will disappear, or will not prove so formidable as at first imagined.

The leading ideas to be kept in mind, in such a movement, should be, *1st.* That the subject of the Gipsies should be investigated and decided on its merits, whatever the consequences. *2d.* That no Scotchman is to be disparaged on account of his blood, but should be treated on his individual merits, as ordinarily recognized by society. *3d.* That being a Gipsy should entitle the person to greater honour, in proportion to his good character, and the hard name the race has hitherto borne. *4th.* That it would be gratifying to have the race "clothed and in its right mind," and "raised up and openly acknowledged," and respected by the rest of the population. *5th.* That it would be interesting, and every way advantageous to themselves and the community at large, for the tribe to acknowledge themselves freely and openly, and form themselves into societies for such purposes as the world recognizes. *6th.* That it should be a credit, rather than a disparagement, for any one to speak the Gipsy language. *7th.* That the word Gipsy should invariably begin with a capital letter.

To show you how the ideas of society change, I may remind you that not long ago none but such as led about bears, monkeys, and raccoons, would dare to wear beards and mustaches; but that soon thereafter they became fashionable among all kinds of people, not excepting grave and reverend clergymen.

WAS JOHN BUNYAN A GIPSY?

AS regards the nationality of John Bunyan, it can be said that he told us most positively what he *was*, and what he was *not*, and it would be strange if no intelligible meaning could be attached to what he informed us on that head. You know that we hang people on circumstantial evidence, actually hang them on the mere force of circumstances, without direct proof, and justly so. Cannot we then use such evidence to prove a simple fact regarding the nationality of a man whose praises are in all the Churches, and indeed in all the world, when every moral and religious, every humane and God-like purpose is to be served by it? And why cannot a question of that kind be settled by society by as rigid rules as would be enforced in a court of justice? Each juryman is sworn to decide by the evidence laid before him, and in no other way. He is also challenged, and if he has already made up his mind on the case, he is excluded. A witness is sworn, and can be imprisoned if he will not testify, and if he testifies falsely, sent to the hulks.

In *Grace Abounding*, John Bunyan says:—

"For my descent, it was, as is well known to many, of a low and inconsiderable generation, my father's house being of that rank that is meanest and most despised of all the families of the land."

Here he speaks most positively of what he *was*—that is, the *meanest* and *most despised* of ALL the families of the land; and as positively of what he was *not*:—

"Another thought came into my mind, and that was, whether we [his family and relations] were of the Israelites or no? For finding in the Scriptures that they were once the peculiar people of God, thought I, if I were one of this race [how significant is the expression!] my soul must needs be happy. Now, again, I found within me a great longing to be resolved about this question, but could not tell how I should. At last I asked my father of it, who told me, No, we [his father included] were not."

Can we possibly apply the language contained in these two extracts to any other than the Gipsies? To assert that Bunyan was not a Gipsy, but a tinker, would be as meaningless as to say that he was not a Gipsy, but a tailor. There can be no question that the *generation* and *family* to which he belonged were Gipsies—the meanest, and most despised of all those of the land, where they had lived for upwards of a century, and had existed in Europe for more than two centuries. Hence, as the tribe is an enigma to itself, no less than to others, the question, *and the great trouble to solve it*, on John Bunyan's part, to ascertain whether he was a *Jew*. Could the language quoted, by any possibility, mean that he was a *common native of England of any kind or calling?* But why did he not say plainly that he was a Gipsy? Simply for the reason that it was death by law to be a Gipsy, and "felony without benefit of clergy" for "any person, being fourteen years, whether natural-born subject or stranger, who had been seen in the fellowship of such persons, or disguised like them, and remained with them one month at once or several times;" to say nothing of the popular odium attaching to the name, which was, in all probability, the greatest reason he had for not using the word, as it is the greatest bar (I might say the only bar) to his nationality being acknowledged to-

day. Even in the United States, I find intelligent and liberal-minded Scotchmen, twenty years absent from their native country, saying, "I would *not like* it to be said," and others, "I would *not have* it said that Bunyan was a Gipsy." Notwithstanding all that, the writer in *Blackwood* says:—

"John Bunyan was so exceedingly plain-spoken, that he would most likely have called himself a Gipsy if he were really one,"

even if he were to be hanged for it, or treated as a felon "without benefit of clergy," and incurred the odium of his fellow-creatures of the native race, when there was no call or occasion for him to say anything about his ancestry or family; and that,

"Our editor's idea of a 'conclusive' proof is a defiance and anathema to any who shall dare to assert the contrary."

It sounds strange, as coming from the seat of legal science in Scotland, to be told that a thing cannot be proved against a man unless he confesses it; and that he is not even to be believed on the point if he does confess it, but declines using a word to which the law and society attach so severe a penalty as the one in question.

You will perceive at once the bearing that Bunyan's nationality will have on the raising up of the name of the Gipsy tribe. People will get accustomed and reconciled to the idea, and entertain a becoming respect for it, were it only on his account; for it unfortunately happens that, owing to the peculiarity of their origin, and the prejudice of the rest of the population, the race hide the fact of their being Gipsies from the rest of the world, as they acquire settled habits, or even leave the tent, so that they never get the credit of any good that may spring from them as a people.*

* What follows did not appear in the paper sent to the Scottish clergy.

In the *Disquisition on the Gipsies*, I have said that "the world never can do justice to Bunyan unless it takes him up as a Gipsy; nor can the Christian, unless he considers him as being a Gipsy, in Abraham's bosom. His biographers have not, even in one instance, done justice to him; for, while it is altogether out of the question to call him the 'wicked tinker,' the 'depraved Bunyan,' it is unreasonable to style him a 'blackguard,' as Southey has done" (p. 519). The argument showing that he was a Gipsy is very fully given on pages 506–523. I may give here a few extracts bearing on his nationality generally:—

John Bunyan has told us as much of his history *as he dared to do*. It was a subject upon which, in some respects, he doubtless maintained a great reserve; for it cannot be supposed that a man occupying so prominent and popular a position, as a preacher and writer, and of so singular an origin, should have had no investigations made into his history, and that of his family; if not by his friends, at least by his enemies, who seemed to have been capable of doing anything to injure and discredit him.* But, very probably, his being a tinker was, with friends and enemies, a circumstance so altogether discreditable, as to render any investigation of the kind perfectly superfluous. In mentioning that much of himself which he did, Bunyan doubtless imagined that the world understood, or would have understood, what he meant, and would, sooner or later, acknowledge the race to which he belonged. And yet it has remained in this unacknowledged state for two centuries since his time. How unreasonable it is to imagine that Bunyan should have said, in as many words, that he was a Gipsy, when the world generally is so apt to become fired with indignation, should we *now* say that he was one of the race. How applicable are

* It is not impossible that people intimate with Bunyan learned from his own mouth that he was a Gipsy, but suppressed the information, under the influence of the unfortunate prejudice that exists against the name, with all the timidity that makes sheep huddle together when attacked by a ravenous animal.

the words of his wife, to Sir Matthew Hale, to the people of the present day:—"Because he is a tinker, and a poor man, he is despised, and cannot have justice." . . . . . John Bunyan was simply a Gipsy of mixed blood, who must have spoken the Gipsy language in great purity; for, considering the extent to which it is spoken in England to-day, we can well believe that it was very pure two centuries ago, and that Bunyan might have written works even in that language (p. 516).

To a candid and unprejudiced person, it should afford a relief, in thinking of the immortal dreamer, that he should have been a member of this singular race, emerging from a state of comparative barbarism, and struggling upwards, amid so many difficulties, rather than he should have been of the very lowest of our own race; for in that case, there is an originality and dignity connected with him personally, that could not well attach to him, in the event of his having belonged to the dregs of the common natives. Beyond being a Gipsy, it is impossible to say what his pedigree really was. His grandfather might have been an ordinary native, even of fair birth, who, in a thoughtless moment, might have "gone off with the Gipsies;" or his ancestor, on the native side of the house, might have been one of the "many English loiterers" who joined the Gipsies on their arrival in England, when they were "esteemed and held in great admiration;" or he might have been a kidnapped infant; or such a "foreign tinker" as is alluded to in the Spanish Gipsy edicts, and in the Act of Queen Elizabeth, in which mention is made of "strangers," as distinguished from natural-born subjects, being with the Gipsies. The last is most probable, as the name, *Bunyan*, would seem to be of foreign origin. It is, therefore, very likely that there was not a drop of common English blood in Bunyan's veins. John Bunyan belongs to the world at large, and England is only entitled to the credit of the formation of his character. Be all that as it may, Bunyan's father seems to have been a superior, and therefore important, man in the tribe, from the fact, as Southey says, of his having "put his son to school in an age when very few of the poor were taught to read and write" (p. 518).

The day is gone by when it cannot be said who John Bunyan was. In Cowper's time his name dare not be mentioned, "lest it should move a sneer." Let us hope that we are living in happier times. Tinkering was Bunyan's *occupation;* his *race* the Gipsy—a fact that cannot be questioned. His having been a Gipsy adds, by contrast, a lustre to his name, and reflects an immortality upon his character; and he stands out, from among all the men of the latter half of the seventeenth century, in all his solitary grandeur, a monument of the grace of God, and a prodigy of genius. Let us, then, enroll John Bunyan as the first (that is known to the world) of eminent Gipsies, the prince of allegorists, and one of the most remarkable of men and Christians. What others of this race there may be who have distinguished themselves among mankind, are known to God and, it may be, some of the Gipsies. The saintly Doctor to whom I have alluded was one of this singular people; and one beyond question, for his admission of the fact cannot be denied by any one. Any life of John Bunyan, or any edition of his works, that does not contain a record of the fact of his having been a Gipsy, lacks the most important feature connected with the man that makes everything relating to him personally interesting to mankind (p. 523).

The innkeeper evidently thought himself in bad company, when our author asked him for the Tinkler's house, or that any intercourse with a Tinkler would contaminate and degrade him. In this light read an anecdote in the history of John Bunyan, who was one of the same people, as I shall afterwards show. In applying for his release from Bedford jail, his wife said to Justice Hale, "Moreover, my lord, I have four small children that cannot help themselves, of which one is blind, and we have nothing to live upon but the charity of good people." Thereat Justice Hale, looking very soberly on the matter, said, "Alas, poor woman!" "What is his calling?" continued the judge. And some of the company, that stood by, said (evidently in interruption, and with a bitter sneer), "A tinker, my lord!" "Yes," replied Bunyan's wife, "and because he is a tinker, and a poor man, therefore he is despised, and cannot have justice." Noble woman! wife of a noble Gipsy! If the world wishes to know who John Bunyan really was, it

can find him depicted in our author's visit to this Scottish Gipsy family; where it can also learn the meaning of Bunyan, at a time when Jews were legally excluded from England, taking so much trouble to ascertain whether he was of that race or not. From the present work generally, the world can learn the reason why Bunyan said nothing of his ancestry and nationality, when giving an account of his own history (Note of Ed., p. 313).*

* A rather singular notice of the *History of the Gipsies* appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, for August, 1866, in which the *Disquisition* is described as "of amusingly pompous and inconsequent nature." And yet the writer speaks of the argument showing that John Bunyan was a Gipsy, as being such, that the reader "makes no struggle to escape the conclusion thus skilfully sprung upon him;" which would show that *that* part of the *Disquisition*, at least, was anything but "inconsequent." He speaks of the theory of Bunyan having been a Gipsy as something "invented," seemingly ignorant of the fact that it is an "invented theory," and a very foolish one at that, that he was a common Englishman. It would be interesting to have an argument in favour of the common native hypothesis, beyond the trifling remarks made by *Blackwood*, which were amply anticipated in the *Disquisition*. In the face of what Bunyan said of himself, it is very unreasonable to hold that he was not a Gipsy, but a common native, when the assumption is all the other way. Let neither, however, be assumed, but let an argument in favour of both be placed alongside of the other, to see how the case would look.

The writer in the *Atlantic* goes on to say:—"His subject has been too much for him, and his mental vision, disordered by too ardent contemplation of Gipsies, reproduces them wherever he turns his thought. If he values any one of his illusions above the rest—for they all seem equally pleasant to him—it is his persuasion that John Bunyan was a Gipsy." It is amusing to notice the presumption of this gentleman—rushing in, in the sheerest wantonness, where, not an angel, but even a fool would fear to tread—in speaking of the contents of the work being "illusions," when the subjects specially treated appear to have been unknown to him, and evidently beyond *his* comprehension or candour. He concludes with the remark:—"Otherwise, the work is a mass of rather interesting rubbish." It would be interesting to know how such ignorance and lack of the ordinary courtesies could have gained admittance to the pages of the *Atlantic*. Perhaps the following will partly explain it:—"Will it be believed that the inventor of this theory [that Bunyan was a Gipsy] was denied admittance to the columns of the religious newspapers in this country, on the flimsy pretext [in one instance] that the editor could not afford the space for a disquisition on John Bunyan's Gipsy origin?" That will be very easily believed, if we consider the difficulty experienced in getting a hearing for any new idea, let it be what it may, and especially if it would unsettle the belief of the world in regard to John Bunyan, however much it might add to his reputation and the interest attaching to him. It was therefore anything but becoming that this writer should have had the discourtesy to insinuate—and more than insinuate—that what I had stated was not true; and apparently made it the grounds of his thoughtless, undignified, and ungrateful remarks about the work generally. It also indicated a low cast of natural intelligence, whatever the education or training, that was anything but creditable to the latitude of Boston. It is doubtful whether a religious or almost any kind of paper has, up to the present time, fairly admitted the idea of John Bunyan having been a Gipsy into its columns; to say nothing of stating it at any length, and giving an opinion whether the question has been settled, or even rendered probable, or not. I think that the argument is sufficiently "consequent" to hang a man, especially if, as the writer in the *Atlantic* says, it is such that the reader "makes no struggle to escape the conclusion thus skilfully sprung upon him." *Blackwood* and the *Atlantic* doubtless hold themselves to be the high-priests of criticism, each in his own country, whose prerogative, sometimes, is rather to endeavour to suppress what contributes to knowledge; playing a part that is a useful though an ignoble one. The remarks of the following journals, although they show a timidity or an aversion to entertain the question, are yet couched in language that entails no discredit on them:—"If our readers are unconvinced, let them not confess it" (*Pall Mall Gazette*).—"He thinks that because John Bunyan was a tinker [and for other reasons], he was almost certainly [rather altogether] of Gipsy origin. . . . We may possibly, some day, devote an article to this strange people" (*British Quarterly*).—"But we are getting on dangerous ground, and as we have no wish to illustrate the proverb, we break off before catching the Gipsy's hypothetical ancestor" (*Westminster Review*). Englishmen, generally, are not in

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE JEWS.

IN thinking of the Gipsies, an allusion to the Jews is natural. Many hold that their existence since the dispersion is a miracle, and others that it is a special providence. Now, miracles are of two kinds; one in which the hand of man does *not* appear, as in the burning bush, and the other in which it *does* appear—both appealing palpably to the senses. In no meaning of the word, then, can the existence of the Jews since the dispersion be a miracle; nor can it be a special providence, for as Providence creates and sustains us, and numbers our years, and counts the hairs on our heads, feeds the sparrows, and clothes the lilies of the field—"preserving and governing all his creatures, and all their actions"—there is no room for a *special* providence. Revelation and miracles, *providence* and grace are the only attributes of the Deity, of that nature, made known to us.

A large part of the Jews never lived in Palestine after the Babylonian captivity, and at the destruction of Jerusalem perhaps the most of the race were abroad, so that they became—what they were already—a scattered people, looking to Palestine as the home of their race and religion, as Catholics, in the matter of creed, have looked to Rome. Although informed by prophecy of what was to befall the Jews, the means bringing it about were of the most ordinary kind—that is, the system of Roman conquest, as applied to all the surrounding nations, and their own passions, factions and vices. Ever since, the Jews have existed in the same position, and by the same means; the dislike and persecution by the world at large, acting on the inherent peculiarities of the race, being alone sufficient to keep them separate from other people. I have discussed the subject pretty fully in the work, showing that the existence of the Jews since the dispersion is in exact harmony with every natural law, and that it would have been a miracle had they ceased to be Jews, and become anything else than what they are today; and that there is no analogy between their history and that of any European nation.

The Jews—a family that are descended from a common parentage

---

the habit of shirking responsibilities of any kind.

In the *Disquisition* are to be found the following sentiments of the Gipsies, that illustrate the question which John Bunyan asked his father:—"We must have been among the Jews, for some of our ceremonies are like theirs" (p. 511). "They naturally think of the Jews, and wonder whether, after all, their race may not, at some time, have been connected with them" (p. 512). This point is naturally laid stress on by Mr. Leland in his *English Gipsies*, published lately, with reference to Bunyan's question, and the great trouble he took to have it answered, "Whether we were of the Israelites or no."

On the occasion of erecting a statue to Bunyan, at Bedford, on the 10th of June last, nothing was said as to who he really was; and yet that is the most important question connected with the illustrious pilgrim's history. The honours then shown to his memory were for the most part bestowed on a being existing only in the imaginations of his worshippers. Had they admitted his Gipsy nationality, they would have isolated him from all of his age, and placed his memory, by contrast, on a pedestal that will outlive bronze and granite. The people of England will make a sorry exhibition of themselves, if such men as the Duke of Bedford and the Dean of Westminster prove capable of being influenced by other motives than a regard for the evidence, in coming to a decision on the important matter at issue.

—possess a physiognomy that distinguishes them at a glance from other people. They hold that, with the exception of themselves, all that are descendants from Adam and Noah form the *common* family of mankind; but that they, the descendants of Abraham and Sarah—the third and last, as a family, to whom a general revelation was made—are distinguished from the rest of the human species, as the *Lord's aristocracy;* and that to them, and them exclusively, was given the only religion of a divine origin. Besides that, the Jews have migrated or been scattered in every direction, where they exist within and independent of other nations; so that the race, as such, could not be destroyed by what might happen in any particular country, for others might migrate from other parts, to contribute to the number, or take the place of those that might have suffered or been destroyed. Paradoxical as it may appear, the way to preserve the existence of a people, is to scatter it, provided it is a race totally distinct from those among whom it may be cast, and has inherent peculiarities calculated to keep it separate from others; and more especially if it is also persecuted, or forbidden, or barely tolerated, to live among others. Its idea of nationality consists in its existing everywhere in general, and nowhere in particular. As contrasted with such a phenomenon, we have the nationality of Europeans consisting merely in birth on the soil—of people whose parents, perhaps, arrived from all parts, and whose nationality and laws, and even the name of their country, might, by events, become blotted out of human remembrance; while their children might acquire or form a new nationality, by being born and reared on another territory.

The Duke of Argyll makes some strange remarks on this subject, in his *Reign of Law.* He says:—"It is not surprising, therefore, that the preservation of the Jews . . . . is tacitly assumed by many persons to come strictly within the category of miraculous events." Why should that be *assumed,* tacitly or otherwise? What if it is only a "vulgar error," started by some person now unknown, and echoed by others after him? It was surely worth while to ascertain whether the foundation was sound on which the following structure was built:—"What is this," says a writer on the evidences of Christianity, "but a miracle? Connected with the prophecy which it fulfils, it is a double miracle. Whether testimony can ever establish the credibility of a miracle is of no importance here. This one is obvious to every man's senses. All nations are its eye-witnesses. . . . The laws of nature have been suspended in their case."

The Duke calls it "a striking illustration how a departure from the 'ordinary course of nature' may be effected through the instrumentality of means which are natural and comprehensible." One would think that anything that was *effected* by what was *natural* and *comprehensible* was no *departure* from the *ordinary course of nature.* He speaks of the Jews being kept distinct from others by "superhuman means," which, however, he says, "belong to the region of the natural." If these means "belong to the region of the natural," how can they be "superhuman," so far as they are the actions of men? What would he call the means which keep Quakers distinct from the rest of the world? Protestants from Catholics in Ireland? Native Scotch from Irish, as imported, or Scotch of Irish lineage and Romish creed? And the various Protestant sects in England so separated from each other? To say nothing of different races in Europe, existing under the same government, occupying the same territory, living even, I believe, in the

same street, and professing substantially the same religion. Let him also turn to India, where the castes have kept themselves distinct from each other from time immemorial, but certainly not by "superhuman" means. Humble Scotch people would indeed be surprised if told they were "preserved" distinct from "thae Irish" by "superhuman" means; and they would be astounded if asked to turn themselves—flesh, bones and blood, physiognomy, mind and religion—into Jews, like those they have living among them; or that these should or could turn themselves, in the same way, into common Scotch.

In Scotland are to be found Scotchmen extracted from members of most of the European nations, who are always more or less reciprocating the favour. Such is the genius of Europeans in regard to nationality, which is exhibited in a striking manner in the United States of America. But it is not so in the East. Englishmen born there do not become Hindoos, Chinese, Japanese, Hottentots, or Negroes, as the case may be. Nor do Asiatics amalgamate and get lost among each other, although by despotism and slavery, polygamy and concubinage, some of the more powerful races or families absorb a little of the blood of others. It has been the genius of almost all, if not all, Asiatic races, from time immemorial, to live separate from each other, as tribes or nations, while dwelling in the same community or country—Jews and Samaritans, Turks and Greeks, Parsees and Armenians, and others unnecessary to mention—and no one ever thinks that these races are kept apart by "special providence" or "superhuman means." And if Asiatics do that among themselves, is it to be supposed they would do otherwise when they come in contact with the races of another continent? It is therefore not true when the Duke asserts that the separate existence of the Jews is "at variance with *all* other experience of the laws which govern the amalgamation with each other of different families of the human race." * It is precisely the contrary, for the isolation of the Jews is in exact harmony with the customs and genius of that part of the world where they originated and had their existence as a people; and which has been increased immeasurably by the special genius of their nation, from the call of Abraham, that it was to exist distinct from all others, and to continue so forever. And the Jews have been so persecuted or disliked by other nations, that they have never, as a people, had the opportunity of "amalgamating and becoming lost among others," assuming that they ever had the wish to do it.

The fact of the Jews keeping distinct from others is a simple question, that is easily understood when investigated inductively and on its merits. It is neither miraculous, a special providence, wonderful, nor remarkable. There is no occasion for the special interference of Providence in a matter that is settled by the Jews on the one side, and by

* Abbé Dubois says:—"In every country of the Peninsula, great numbers of foreign families are to be found, whose ancestors had been obliged to emigrate thither, in times of trouble or famine, from their native land, and to establish themselves amongst strangers. This species of emigration is very common in all the countries of India; but what is most remarkable is, *that in a foreign land, these emigrants preserve, from generation to generation, their own language and national peculiarities.* Many instances might be pointed out of such foreign families, settled four or five hundred years in the district they now inhabit, without approximating in the least to the manners, fashions, or even to the language of the nation where they have been for so many generations naturalized. They still preserve the remembrance of their origin, and keep up the ceremonies and usages of the land where their ancestors were born, without ever receiving any tincture of the particular habits of the countries where they live."—*Preface*, xvii.

the rest of the world on the other. Perhaps the best way for Providence to preserve the Jews as they have existed since the dispersion would have been merely to leave them alone—leave them to their impenitence and unbelief, and take that much care of them that is taken of ravens; and that would consist with their relation to Him—that of rebels against the majesty of heaven, and outcasts from His presence. Before asking how it is that the Jews exist to-day, it would be well to inquire by what possible process they could cease to be Jews; and by what *human* means they, as a people, will receive Christ as their Messiah, and thereby become *Christian Jews*. It is no wonder that they should be Jews, as all the circumstances that have kept them distinct from others during past generations continue to keep them apart at the present day. It is quite sufficient for the Christian to know that the Jews exist, and that they have fulfilled, and will yet fulfil the prophecies that have been delivered in regard to them, and that they are a living proof of the truth of Christianity, without holding that any miracle has been wrought for that end. He should be more considerate in his estimate of what a miracle is, and not maintain that the existence of the Jews is one, for nothing having the decent appearance of an argument can be advanced in support of such a theory; and far less should he, like the writer on the Christian evidences alluded to, stake, in a spirit of gambling, the whole question of revelation on his own dogma, and according to his hypothesis lose it. "Yea, we establish the law."

The Duke says, "The case of the Gipsies has been referred to as somewhat parallel. But the facts of this case are doubtful and obscure, and such of them as we know involve conditions altogether dissimilar in kind." I should not imagine that he knows personally much of either, particularly the Gipsies. His remark is too short, vague and obscure to admit of any comment being made on it. For a full discussion of the two questions, I refer him to the *History of the Gipsies*, which was published a year before the first edition of the *Reign of Law* appeared; and two years before the fifth edition, in which corrections were made to meet criticisms on various matters treated in it. I may add, that the subject of the Jews is not so well known to the world at large, as to justify the many positive assertions that have been made in regard to them.*

To elucidate the subject of the preservation of the Jews, I add a few extracts from the *Disquisition on the Gipsies*.

The circumstances connected with the perpetuation of the Gipsy and Jewish races greatly resemble each other. Both races are scattered over the face of the earth. The Jew has had a home; he has a strong attachment to it, and looks forward to enter it at some future day. Make the acquaintance of the Jews, and you will find that each generation of them tell *their* "wonderful story" to the following generation, and the story is repeated to the following, and the following. The children of Jews are taught to know that they are Jews before they can even lisp. Soon do they know that much of the phenomenon of their race, as regards its origin, its history, and its universality, to draw the distinction between them and those around them who are not Jews. Soon do they learn how their race has been despised and persecuted, and imbibe the love which their parents have for it, and the resentment of the odium cast upon it by others. It has been so from the beginning of their history out of Palestine, and even while there. Were it only religion, considered in itself, that has kept the Jews together as a people, they might have got lost among the rest of mankind; for among the Jews there are to be found the rankest of infidels; even Jewish priests

* What follows did not appear in the paper sent to the Scottish clergy.

will say that, "it signifies not what a man's religion may be, if he is only sincere in it." Is it a feeling, or a knowledge, of religion that leads a Jewish child, almost the moment it can speak, to say that it is a Jew? It is simply the workings of the phenomena of race that account for this; the religion peculiar to Jews having been introduced among them centuries after their existence as a people. Being exclusively theirs in its very nature, they naturally follow it, as other people do theirs; but although, from the nature of its origin, it presents infinitely greater claims upon their intelligent belief and obedience, they have yielded no greater submission to its spirit and morals, or even to its forms, than many other people have done to their religion, made up, as that has been, of the most fabulous superstition, on the principle, doubtless, that

"The zealous crowds in ignorance adore,
And still, the less they know, they fear the more." *

The Jews being a people before they received the religion by which they are distinguished, it follows that the religion, in itself, occupies a position of secondary importance, although the profession of it acts and reacts upon the people, in keeping them separate from others. The most, then, that can be said of the religion of the Jews is, that, following in the wake of their history as a people, it is only one of the pillars by which the building is supported.† If inquiry is made of Jewish converts to Christianity, we will find that, notwithstanding their having separated from their brethren, on points of creed, they hold themselves as much Jews as before. But the conversions of Jews are,

"Like angels' visits, few and far between."

In the case of individuals forsaking the Jewish, and joining the Christian, Church, that is, believing in the Messiah having come, instead of to come, it is natural, I may say inevitable, for them to hold themselves Jews. They have feelings which the world cannot understand. But beyond the nationality, physiognomy, and feelings of Jews, there are no points of difference, and there ought to be no grounds of offence, between them and the ordinary inhabitants (p. 473).

Substitute the language and signs of the Gipsies for the religion of the Jews, and we find that the rearing of the Gipsies is almost identical with that of the Jews; and in the same manner do they hold themselves to be Gipsies. But the one can be Gipsies, though ignorant of their language and signs, and the other, Jews, though ignorant of their religion; the mere sense of tribe and community being sufficient to constitute them members of their respective nationalities (p. 475).

But how different is the position which the Jews occupy towards the rest of the world! They are certainly quiet and inoffensive enough as individuals, or as a community; whence, then, arises the dislike which most people have for them? The Gipsies may be said to be, in a sense, strangers amongst

* The following extract from *Leaves from the Diary of a Jewish Minister*, published in the *Jewish Messenger*, on the 4th April, 1862, may not be uninteresting to the Christian reader:—

"In our day, the conscience of Israel is seldom troubled; it is of so elastic a character, that, like gutta percha [india-rubber?], it stretches and is compressed, according to the desire of its owner. We seldom hear of a troubled conscience. . . . . Not that we would assert that our people are without a conscience; we merely state that we seldom hear of its troubles. It is more than probable, that when the latent feeling is aroused on matters of religion, and for a moment they have an idea that 'their soul is not well,' they take a homœopathic dose of spiritual medicine, and then feel quite convalescent." (p. 503).

† The only part of the religion of the Jews having an origin prior to the establishment of the Mosaic law was circumcision, which was termed the covenant made by God with Abraham and his seed (Gen. xvii. 10–14). The abolition of idols, and the worship of God alone, are presumed, although not expressed. The Jews lapsed into gross idolatry while in Egypt, but were not likely to neglect circumcision, as that was necessary to maintain a physical uniformity among the race, but did not enter into the wants, and hopes, and fears inherent in the human breast, and stimulated by the daily exhibition of the phenomena of its existence. The second table of the moral law was, of course, written upon the hearts of the Jews, in common with those of the Gentiles (Rom. ii. 14, 15). (P. 474.)

us, because they have never been acknowledged by us; but the Jews are, to a certain extent, strangers under any circumstances, and, more or less, look to entering Palestine at some day, it may be this year, or the following. If a Christian asks, "Who are the Jews, and what do they here?" the reply is very plain:—"They are rebels against the Majesty of Heaven, and outcasts from His presence." They are certainly entitled to every privilege, social and political, which other citizens enjoy; they have a perfect right to follow their own religion; but other people have an equal right to express their opinion in regard to it and them (p. 484).

The position which Jews occupy among Christians is that which they occupy among people of a different faith. They become obnoxious to people everywhere; for that which is so foreign in its origin, so exclusive in its habits and relations, and so conceited and antagonistic in its creed, will always be so, go where it may. Besides, they will not even eat what others have slain; and hold other people as impure. The very conservative nature of their creed is, to a certain extent, against them; were it aggressive, like the Christian's, with a genius to embrace *all* within its fold, it would not stir up, or permanently retain, the same ill-will toward the people who profess it; for being of that nature which retires into the corner of selfish exclusiveness, people will naturally take a greater objection to them. Then, the keen, money-making, and accumulating habits of the Jews make them appear selfish to those around them; while the greediness and utter want of principle that characterize some of them have given a bad reputation to the whole body, however unjustly it is applied to them as a race (p. 486).

The circumstances attending the Jews' entry into any country to-day are substantially what they were before the advent of Christ; centuries before which era, they were scattered, in great numbers, over most parts of the world; having synagogues, and visiting or looking to Jerusalem, as their home, as Catholics, in the matter of religion, have looked to Rome. In going abroad, Jews would as little contemplate forsaking their own religion, and worshipping the gods of the heathen, as do Christians to-day in Oriental countries; for they were as thoroughly persuaded that their religion was divine, and all others the inventions of man, as are Christians of theirs. Then it was a religion exclusively Jewish, that is, the people following it were, with rare exceptions, exclusively Jews by nation. The ill-will which all these circumstances, and the very appearance of the people themselves, have raised against the Jews, and the persecutions, of various kinds, which have universally followed, have widened the separation between them and other people, which the genius of their religion made so imperative, and their feelings of nationality—nay, *family*—so exclusive. Before the dispersion, Palestine was their home; after the dispersion, the position and circumstances of those abroad at the time underwent no change; they would merely contemplate their nation in a new aspect—that of exiles, and consider themselves, for the time being, at home wherever they happened to be. Those that were scattered abroad, by the destruction of Jerusalem, would, in their persons, confirm the convictions of the others, and reconcile them to the idea, that the Jewish nation, as such, was abroad on the face of the earth; and each generation of the race would entertain the same sentiments. After this, as before it, it can scarcely be said that the Jews have ever been tolerated; if not actually persecuted, they have, at least, always been disliked, or despised. The whole nation having been scattered abroad, with everything pertaining to them as a nation, excepting the temple, the high-priesthood, and the sacrifices, with such an ancient history, and so unequivocally divine a religion, so distinct from, and obnoxious to, those of other nations, it is no wonder that they, the common descendants of Abraham and Sarah, should have ever since remained a distinct people in the world; as all the circumstances surrounding them have universally remained the same till to-day (p. 487).

A Jew of to-day has a much greater aversion to forsake the Jewish community than any other man has to renounce his country; and his associations of nationality are manifested wherever a Jewish society is to be found, or wherever he can meet with another Jew. This is the view which he takes of his race, as something distinct from his religion; for he contemplates himself as being of that people—

of the same blood, features, and feelings, all children of Abraham and Sarah —that are to be found everywhere; that part of it to which he has an aversion being only such as apostatize from his religion, and more particularly such as embrace the Christian faith. In speaking of Jews, we are too apt to confine our ideas exclusively to a creed, forgetting that Jews are a race; and that Christian Jews are Jews as well as Jewish Jews. Were it possible to bring about a reformation among the Jews, by which synagogues would embrace the Christian faith, we would see Jewish Christian churches; the only difference being, that they would believe in him whom their fathers pierced, and lay aside only such of the ceremonies of Moses as the Gospel had abrogated. If a movement of that kind were once fairly afoot, by which was presented to the Jew, his people as a community, however small it might be, there would be a great chance of his becoming a Christian, in one sense or other: he could then assume the position of a protesting Jew, holding the rest of his countrymen in error; and his own Christian-Jewish community as representing his race, as it ought to exist. At present, the few Christian Jews find no others of their race with whom to form associations as a community; so that, to all intents and purposes, they feel as if they were a sort of outcasts, despised and hated by those of their own race, and separated from the other inhabitants by a natural law, over which neither have any control, however much they may associate with and respect each other (p. 488).

The main prop of a Jew for remaining a Jew, in regard to religion, rests much more upon the wonderful phenomena connected with the history of his nation—its antiquity, its associations, its universality, and the length of time which it has existed, since its dispersion, distinct from the rest of the world, and so unique (as he imagines), that he at once concludes it must have the special approbation of God for the position which it occupies; which is very true, although it proceeds from a different motive than that which the Jew so vainly imagines. The Jew imagines that God approves of his conduct, in his stubborn rebellion to the claims of Christianity, because he finds his race existing so distinct from the rest of the world; whereas, if he studies his own Scriptures, he will see that the condition of his race is the punishment due to its rebellion (p. 490).

The history of the Jews acts as a spell upon the unfortunate Jew, and proves the greatest bar to his conversion to Christianity. He vainly imagines that his race stands out from among all the races of mankind, by a miracle, wrought for that purpose, and with the special approbation of God upon it, for adhering to its religion; and that, therefore, Christianity is a delusion (p. 491).

Christians not only flatter but delude the Jew, when they say that his race is "purity itself;" they greatly flatter and delude him, when they say that the phenomenon of its existence, since the dispersion, is miraculous. There is nothing miraculous about it. There is nothing miraculous about the perpetuation of Quakerdom; yet Quakerdom has existed for two centuries. Although Quakerdom is but an artificial thing, that proceeded out from among common English people, it has somewhat the appearance of being a distinct race, among those surrounding it. As such, it appears, at first sight, to inexperienced youth, or people who have never seen, or perhaps heard much of Quakers. But how much greater is the difference between Jews and Christians, than between Quakers and ordinary Englishmen, and Americans! And how much greater the certainty that Jews will keep themselves distinct from Christians, and all others in the world! It must be self-evident to the most unreflecting person, that the natural causes which keep Jews separated from other people, during one generation, continue to keep them distinct during every other generation. A miracle, indeed! We must look into the Old and New Testaments for miracles. A Jew will naturally delude himself about the existence of his race since the dispersion being a miracle; yet not believe upon a person if he were even to rise from the dead (p. 493)!

While the history of the Jews, since the dispersion, greatly illustrates that of the Gipsies, so does the history of the Gipsies greatly illustrate that of the Jews. They greatly resemble each other. Jews shuffle when they say that the only difference between an Englishman and an English Jew, is in the matter of creed; for there is a great difference between the two, whatever they

may have in common, as men born and reared on the same soil. The very appearance of the two is palpable proof that they are not of the same race. The Jew invariably and unavoidably holds his "nation" to mean the Jewish people, scattered over the world; and is reared in the idea that he is, not only in creed, but in blood, distinct from other men; and that, in blood and creed, he is not to amalgamate with them, let him live where he may. Indeed, what England is to an Englishman, this universally scattered people is to the Jew; what the history of England is to an Englishman, the Bible is to the Jew; his nation being nowhere in particular, but everywhere, while its ultimate destiny he, more or less, believes to be Palestine. Now, an Englishman has not only been born an Englishman, but his mind has been cast in a mould that makes him an Englishman; so that, to persecute him, on the ground of his being an Englishman, is to persecute him for that which can never be changed. It is precisely so with the Jew. His creed does not amount to much, for it is only part of the history of his race, or the law of his nation, traced to, and emanating from, one God, and Him the true God, as distinguished from the gods and lords many of other nations: such is the nature of the Jewish theocracy (p. 496).

The being a Gipsy, or a Jew, or a Gentile, consists in birth and rearing. The three may be born and brought up under one general roof, members of their respective nationalities, yet all good Christians. But the Jew, by becoming a Christian, necessarily cuts himself off from associations with the representative part of his nation; for Jews do not tolerate those who forsake the synagogue, and believe in Christ, as the Messiah having come; however much they may respect their children, who, though born into the Christian Church, and believing in its doctrines, yet maintain the inherent affection for the associations connected with the race, and more especially if they also occupy distinguished positions in life. So intolerant, indeed, are Jews of each other, in the matter of each choosing his own religion, extending sometimes to assassination in some countries, and invariably to the cruellest persecutions in families, that they are hardly justified in asking, and scarcely merit, toleration for themselves, as a people, from the nations among whom they live. The present Disraeli doubtless holds himself to be a Jew, let his creed or Christianity be what it may; if he looks at himself in his mirror, he cannot deny it. We have an instance in the Capadose family becoming and remaining for several generations Christians, then returning to the synagogue, and in another generation joining the Christian Church. The same vicissitude may attend future generations of this family. There should be no great obstacle in the way of it being allowed to pass current in the world, like any other fact, that a person can be a Jew and at the same time a Christian; as we say that a man can be an Englishman and a Christian, a McGregor and a Christian, a Gipsy and a Christian, or a Jew and a Christian, even should he not know when his ancestors attended the synagogue. Christianity was not intended, nor is it capable, to destroy the nationality of Jews, as individuals, or as a nation, any more than that of other people (p. 497).

In my associations with Gipsies and Jews, I find that both races rest upon the same basis, viz: a question of people. The response of the one, as to who he is, is that he is a Gipsy; and of the other, that he is a Jew. Each of them has a peculiarly original soul, that is perfectly different from each other, and others around them; a soul that passes as naturally and unavoidably into each succeeding generation of the respective races, as does the soul of the English or any other race into each succeeding generation. For each considers his nation as abroad upon the face of the earth; which circumstance will preserve its existence amid all the revolutions to which ordinary nations are subject. As they now exist within, and independent of, the nations among whom they live, so will they endure if these nations were to disappear under the subjection of other nations, or become incorporated with them under new names. Many of the Gipsies and Jews might perish amid such convulsions, but those that survived would constitute the stock of their respective nations; while others might migrate from other countries, and contribute to their numbers (p. 499).

In considering the phenomenon of the existence of the Jews since the dispersion, I am not inclined to place it on

any other basis than I would that of the Gipsies; for, with both, it is substantially a question of people. They are a people, scattered over the world, like the Gipsies, and have a history—the Bible, which contains both their history and their laws; and these two contain their religion. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say that the religion of the Jews is to be found in the Talmud, and the other human compositions, for which the race have such a superstitious reverence; and even these are taken as interpreted by the Rabbis. A Jew has, properly speaking, little of a creed. He believes in the existence of God, and in Moses his prophet, and observes certain parts of the ceremonial law, and some holidays commemorative of events in the history of his people. He is a Jew, in the first place, as a simple matter of fact, and, as he grows up, he is made acquainted with the history of his race, to which he becomes strongly attached. He then holds himself to be one of the "first-born of the Lord," one of the "chosen of the Eternal," one of the "Lord's aristocracy;" expressions of amazing import in his worldly mind, that will lead him to almost die for his *faith:* while his *religion* is of a very low natural order, "standing only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances," suitable for a people in a state of pupilage. The Jewish mind in the matter of religion is, in some respects, pre-eminently gross and material in its nature; its idea of a Messiah rising no higher than a conqueror of its own race, who will bring the whole world under his sway, and parcel out, among his fellow-Jews, a lion's share of the spoils, consisting of such things as the inferior part of human nature so much craves for. And his ideas of how this Messiah is to be connected with the original tribes, as mentioned in the prophecies, are childish and superstitious in the extreme. Writers do, therefore, greatly err, when they say, that it is only a thin partition that separates Judaism from Christianity. There is almost as great a difference between the two, as there is between that which is material, and that which is spiritual. A Jew is so thoroughly bound, heart and soul, by the spell which the phenomena of his race exert upon him, that, humanly speaking, it is impossible to make anything of him in the matter of Christianity. And herein, in his own way of thinking, consists his peculiar glory. Such being the case with Christianity, it is not to be supposed that the Jew would forsake his own religion, and, of course, his own people, and believe in any religion having an origin in the spontaneous and gradual growth of superstition and imposture, modified, systematized, adorned, or ex-expanded, by ambitious and superior minds, or almost wholly in the conceptions of these minds; having, for a foundation, an instinct—an intellectual and emotional want—as common to man as instinct is to the brute creation, for the ends which it has to serve.* We cannot separate the questions of race and belief, when we consider the Jews as a people, however it might be with individuals among them (p. 501.)

Amid all the obloquy and contempt cast upon his race, amid all the persecutions to which it has been exposed, the Jew, with his inherent conceit in having Abraham for his father, falls back upon the history of his nation, with the utmost contempt for everything else that is human; forgetting that there is such a thing as the "first being last." He boasts that his race, and his only, is eternal, and that all other men get everything from *him!* He vainly imagines that the Majesty of Heaven should have made his dispensations to mankind conditional upon anything so unworthy as his race has so frequently shown itself to be. If he has been so favoured by God, what can he point to as the fruits of so much loving-kindness shown him? What is his nation now, however numerous it may be, but a ruin, and its members, but spectres that haunt it? And what has brought it to its present condition? "Its sins." Doubtless, its sins; but what particular sins? And how are these sins to be put away, seeing that the temple, the high-priesthood, and the sacrifices no longer exist? Or what effort, by such means as offer, has ever been made to mitigate the wrath of God, and prevail upon Him to restore the people to their exalted privileges? Or what could they even propose doing, to bring about that event? Questions like these involve the Jewish mind in a labyrinth of difficulties, from which it cannot extricate itself. The dispersion

* Quoted at pages 51 and 52.

PAGE

BORROW, GEORGE, his speculations regarding the origin of the Gipsies, . 114
His visit to Yetholm :—The secrecy of the Gipsies in regard to the language, 115; the extent of the queen's knowledge of it, *Ib.;* the peculiarities of the tribe in regard to it, 116; an appointment, a disappointment, and a meeting at the fair, *Ib.;* the queen and her niece, *Ib.;* peculiarities of Yetholm mixed Gipsies, 117, 118; Thomas Herne's family, *n*117, 131; his estimate of the extent of the language, 118; the character of the queen, *Ib.;* his definition of *Nokkum*, *n*119; not a judge of character, *Ib.;* his visit to Yetholm in some respects unsatisfactory, *Ib.*
Gipsy surnames, ... 121
Gipsies stealing children, ... 121, 122
Gipsies harbouring priests, and running wenches, ... 122
His strange contradictions about the Gipsies speaking their language, . 123
His description of three kinds of travelling people in England, 130, 131, 133
Mr. Borrow a strange phenomenon connected with the Gipsies, . . 132
On the English Gipsy language, ... 138
On the hatred the Gipsies have for other people, ... *n*149
BREWSTER, SIR DAVID, his letter to Prof. James Forbes, ... 81
BRIGHT, DR., on the secrecy of the Gipsies in regard to their language, 123, 140
BRITANNICA, ENCYLOPÆDIA, THE, does not allude to snakes swallowing their young, ... 10
On the hatching of crocodiles' eggs, ... 32
BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, THE, on the Gipsies and John Bunyan, . *n*160
BUCKLAND, FRANK, on vipers swallowing their young, . . . 8, 14, 23, *n*39
Requested to make experiments on the subject, ... 13, 14, 24
On snakes shedding their skins, ... *n*23
On the hatching of their eggs, ... 31, 32
BUFFALOES, how they protect their young against wolves, ... 45
BUNSEN, CHEVALIER, on sound judgments and shallow minds, . . . 153
BUNYAN, JOHN, on child-stealing, ... 122
His description of what he was, and what he was not, ... 157
The penalties attaching to the name of Gipsy, ... 157
His name calculated to raise up that of the Gipsy tribe, . . . 158
The injustice of his biographers towards his memory, ... 158
His nationality still unacknowledged, ... 158
He might have written works in the Gipsy language, ... 159
His most probable pedigree as a Gipsy, ... 159
The first of eminent Gipsies known to the world, ... 159
A Scottish Gipsy family that illustrates that of Bunyan, . . . 159
Has a statue raised to his memory at Bedford, ... *n*161
BURR, HIGFORD, on snakes shedding their skins, ... *n*22
BUTLER'S ANALOGY, the influence it had on James Mill, ... 70

CANTING, the, of Mill, ... 80, 107
CAPADOSE FAMILY, vicissitudes in the religious history of the, . . . 168
CARLYLE, THOMAS, his so-called anti-self-consciousness theory, . . . 95
The opinion of the Mills regarding him, ... 108

PAGE
CASTE in Great Britain, ... 146, n147, 148, 150, 154, 155
in India, ... 163
in the United States, ... 146
CATS will generally catch rats only under certain circumstances, . . . 14
CHAMBERS' ENCYCLOPÆDIA on the hatching of vipers' eggs, . . . 28
Time of birth of vipers, and number of progeny, ... 29
CHAMBERS' JOURNAL on the disappearance of the Gipsies, ... n111
CHINA, Gipsies in, ... 141
CICERO on the belief in an ancestral religion, ... 59, 60, 66
On the existence of God, ... 79, 80
COMTE on receiving information from others on certain subjects, . . . 75
The influence his *Traité de Législation* had on Mill, ... 77
On the great things philosophers are to do, ... 81
The influence he had on Mill's *Logic*, ... 104
CRABBE, REV. JAMES, his mission among the English Gipsies, . . . 136
CROCODILE, the, how its eggs are hatched, and its young taken care of, . 32
CUMMING, W. GORDON, on snakes swallowing frogs, ... 41

DEER, their antipathy to the rattlesnake, ... n15
DEIFICATION among Pagans, ... n53
DICKENS, CHARLES, and the Gipsies, ... 152, 153
DISRAELI, the present, a Jew as well as a Christian, ... 168
DIVINITY STUDENTS (SCOTCH), the nature and length of their studies, . 70
The effects that patronage had on them, ... n71
The disadvantages they are under in the start in life, ... n89
They could acquire more knowledge of the world than they do, . . n90
DUBOIS, ABBÉ, on scattered races in India, ... n163

EDINBURGH REVIEW, THE, on James Mill's reading of sceptical books, . 70
On Mill as a servant of the East India Company, ... 72
On his quarrelling with his friends on Mrs. Taylor's account, . . 99
Its estimate of Mrs. Mill, ... 101
On Mill's public services, ... 105
On Benthamism, and some of Mill's peculiarities, ... 109
EDUCATION, what might be called a common sense and useful one, . . 84
Among the Gipsies, ... n132, 159
ENGLISH GIPSIES, ... 127–129, 142
EPICTETUS, his prayer, ... 78
On the existence of God, ... 79
On the lack of common sense in some philosophers, ... 94
ETHIOPIA, the Scottish Gipsies say they came from, ... n143
ETHNOLOGY on its legs, ... 112

FAAS, the Gipsy, at Yetholm, ... 117, 119, 120
FALL, MRS., of Dunbar, a Gipsy, ... 144
FIGUIER'S *Reptiles and Birds*—How tortoises are hatched, ... 33
FORBES, PROF. JAMES, letter to him from Sir David Brewster, . . . 81
FRANKLIN, BENJAMIN, on Jesus of Nazareth, ... 75

PAGE

FRANKLIN, BENJAMIN, his creed, ... *n*75
FRASER'S MAGAZINE on Mill's associating with Mrs. Taylor, . . . 99
FROGS as eaten by snakes, ... 7, 27, 31, 41
FROGS' mode of propagation, ... 32

GIPSIES, probable number of the, in Great Britain and Ireland, . . . 111
How they mix their blood and perpetuate their race, . . 112, 126, 127
Their secrecy in regard to their language, . . 115, 116, 118, 120, 123
Gipsy surnames, ... 121, 130
Stealing children, ... 121, 122
Spanish Gipsies, ... 123–127
Hungarian Gipsies, ... 123, *n*125, 138
English Gipsies, ... 127–129, 142
Irish Gipsies, ... 129, *n*132, 141
Education among the Gipsies, ... *n*132, 159
The natural perpetuation of the race, ... 133, 134
How the subject should be investigated, ... 134
How a Gipsy is reared, ... 135
The effects of the prejudice that exists against the Gipsy race, . 136, 146
How they gradually leave the tent, and acquire settled habits, . . 136
The love which they have for their language, ... 137
How the language is taught, and how it has got mixed with others, . 138
How they resent the curiosity of others in regard to their language, . 139
American Gipsies, ... 141
The universality of the race, ... 141
Its destiny, ... 142
The difference between mixed Gipsies and ordinary natives, . . . 143
Peculiarities of settled Gipsies, ... 143–145
How they resent the prejudice that exists against them, . . . 147
Their ideas of their social position, ... 147
How they "marry among themselves," and "stick to each other," . 148
Improvement of the Gipsies, ... 148–150, 156
Arrival of the tribe in Scotland, in 1506, ... 150
Their organization, social position, and destiny, ... 151
Civilized Gipsies, ... 151
Their secrecy, nature, and mutual sympathies, ... 152
The perpetuation of the Gipsies resembles that of the Jews, . 164, 167, 168
GOODE, PROF. G. BROWN, his information on American snakes, . . 36–38
GOSSE, P. H., on the Jamaica boa generally, ... 33
On snakes fascinating birds, ... 41
GREEK CHURCH, THE, Romanists' aversion to hear it mentioned, . . . 55
It scorns the claims of Rome, and denies its baptism, ... 60
Its confessional and status generally, ... 61
GRELLMANN on the colour of the Gipsies as they become civilized, . . *n*125
On the secrecy of the Gipsies in regard to their language, . . 123, 138
GUTHRIE, DR. THOMAS, on the effects of patronage on Scotch divinity students, ... *n*71
His advantages as a student and probationer compared with others, . *n*90

PAGE
HALE, SIR MATTHEW, his interview with Bunyan's wife, ... 159
HOYLAND, JOHN, on Gipsy surnames, ... 121
HUMBOLDT, as an ornithologist, as estimated by Waterton, ... 39
HUNGARIAN GIPSIES, ... 123, *n*125, 138
HUNTER, JOHN DUNN, on snakes in the Western States of America, . . *n*15
On the rattlesnake swallowing its young, ... 34
On the rattlesnake charming or magnetizing birds, ... 40
How buffaloes protect their young against wolves, ... 45

INDIA, James Mill's *History of*, ... 71, 85, 109
IRISH GIPSIES in Great Britain and the United States, ... 129, *n*132, 141

JAMAICA, experiments on the boa wanted in, ... 35
JESUITS, Waterton educated by the, ... 47
The dislike of other people for them, ... 47
The end of their teaching, ... 48
Their policy as described by Southey, ... *n*48
The honour in which they hold Christ and his Apostles, ... 57
JEWS, the, disliked by the Gipsies, ... 130
Their language during the Babylonian captivity, ... 140
The Gipsies marry among themselves, like the Jews, ... 148
Protected by a cloud while in the wilderness, ... 155
A scattered people before the destruction of Jerusalem, ... 161
The means of their dispersion, ... 161
The Jews an exclusive family, possessing an exclusive religion, . . 162
Their peculiar nature, special genius, and persecution keep them distinct from others, ... 163
The isolation of the Jews effected entirely by natural causes, . . 164
How a Jew is reared, ... 164
His religion a secondary consideration, ... 164
The indifference of many Jews to their religion, ... *n*165
The religion of the Jews previous to the Mosaic law, ... *n*165
The position they occupy in the world to-day, ... 165
How they were affected by the destruction of Jerusalem, ... 166
The light in which they look on their race and religion, ... 166
The phenomena of their race the greatest bar to their conversion to Christianity, ... 167
The comparison and contrast between an Englishman and an English Jew, 167
How Jews tolerate each other in the matter of religion, ... 168
The profession of Christianity does not destroy the nationality of Jews, 168
The peculiar genius of the Jews as a scattered people, ... 168
Their religion, and the light in which they look on themselves, . . 169
Their ideas of a Messiah, ... 169
The phenomenon of the Jews as a scattered people, ... 169
JOB on the ostrich, ... 23
On the mystery of his existence, ... 81
JOHNSON, SAMUEL, on a person becoming religious, ... 64
On a certain kind of ambition, ... 153

PAGE

LELAND, C. G., on Dickens and the Gipsies, ... *n*153
On John Bunyan's nationality, ... *n*161
LEWIS AND CLARKE'S allusion to wolves hunting their prey, . . . 45

MARMONTEL'S *Memoires*—The alleged effect they had on Mill, . . 93, 96
MARRIAGE in connection with Mill, ... 98, 99, 101, 104, 105
METHODISM, Mill's allusion to, ... 92, 96
MILL, JAMES, his education for the Church, and rejection of all religion, . 69
Becomes a tutor, and then settles in London as an author, . . . 69
His personal character as described by his son, ... 69, 71, 86–88
His religious history previous to his becoming a practical atheist, 69, 70, 76
The effect that *Butler's Analogy* had on him, ... 70
His reading of sceptical books while at college, ... 70
His playing the hypocrite for the benefit of the worldly advancement, 70, 71
His literary character as described by his son, . . 71, 85, 108, 109
Becomes the servant and satellite of the East India Company, . . 72
His careful training of his family to have no religious belief, . . . 73
His ideas on religion generally, ... 73, 76, 82
His ideas on the subject and standard of morality, . . . 73, 80
The odiousness of his religious, or want of religious, sentiments, . . 74
His temper, deportment, and mode of instructing his children at home, 86, 87
His humble rearing, ... 89
His unfitness to have the charge of children, ... 89
The estimate he put on feeling, ... 96
How he left the world, ... 108
His ideas on human life, education, and government, . . . 108–110
His letter to Jeremy Bentham, ... 108
MILL, JOHN STUART, is brought up without any religious belief, . . 69, 73
As a servant and satellite of the East India Company, . . . 72, 91
On the bad effects of reticence in the matter of religion, . . . 72
His aristocratic standing as an English atheist, ... 72
His ideas of the worship of God in any form, ... 73
His ideas on the subject and standard of morality, 73, 80, 85, 95, 96, 100
On religion in general, ... 74–77, 82
He makes a religion of his wife's memory, ... 77
His philosophical canting, ... 80, 107
His utopian ideas on what philosophers are to accomplish, . . . 81
Proposes his education as an example for others, ... 82
The probable opinion of the world in regard to it, ... 83
His early "studies," 83
His wonderful acquirements, ... 84
His complete break-down in defining the words, idea, and theory, . 84
His crude ideas regarding education and the capacity of children, 84, 85
As a "tumbler" in the "arena of thought," 86, 95
As a speaker, ... *n*86
As a teacher of his brothers and sisters, ... 87
On the "corrupting influences" of boys, and his lack of boyish amusements, ... 87

PAGE

MILL, JOHN STUART, how he ultimately shook himself clear of his father, . 89
On the ungodliness, unnatural treatment, and cruelty in his education, . 90
He begins at fifteen to be a "reformer of the world," . . . 90, 92
His life previous to his engagement with the East India Company, . 91
Attacked by a nervous disorder—A "crisis in his mental history," . 92
How he emerged from it, with the results it had on him, . . . 93
The apparent cause of the disorder, ... 94
His estimate of the break-down in his father's system of instruction, . 95
His crude ideas regarding the "basis of his philosophy of life," . . 95
His ideas of the cultivation of the feelings, music, poetry, and human affections, ... 96
The treatment he should have had during the "crisis in his mental history," 94, 96
The extravagant language inscribed on his wife's tomb, . . . 101
His deficiency in looking at two sides, not to say all sides, of a question, 101
Egotism as part of his character, ... 83, 102, 108, 110
The firm of Mill, Son & Co.—Its establishment, principles, and sign or coat-of-arms, ... 102
The loss he sustained intellectually by the death of his father, . . 102
His "apostleship" that of rank atheism, ... 105
His principles destructive of the opinions and institutions of his country, 105
The mischief-making tendencies of his nature and teaching, . . 105, 110
A fanatic as judged by the standard of his father, ... 106
A made or manufactured man, as described by himself, . . . 106
Educated and trained like a stalled ox, ... 106
Much of a demagogue in his principles and practices, ... 106
His crude and raw-lad-like peculiarities, ... 106, 107
His deficiency in common sense, and delicacy or manliness of feeling, 94, 107
His ideas regarding Carlyle, ... 108
His various changes, ... 110
An estimate of some aspects of his character, ... 110

MILL, MRS., her memory made a religion of by her husband, ... 77
Was she also an atheist, like himself? 78, 99
His regard for her the main reason for writing his Autobiography, . 97
How Mill made her acquaintance, ... 97
Her talents, and the great influence she exercised over him, . . 97
Leaves her husband, Mr. Taylor, for the society of Mill, . . . 97
Repudiation of criminality in the relation, ... 98
Her intimacy with Mill a source of bitterness to her husband, . . 99
And the cause of a separation between Mill and his friends, . . . 99
The peculiar ideas of Mill and Mrs. Taylor on the subject of liberty, . 99
The uncertainty of Mrs. Taylor's support while separated from her husband, ... 100
The death of Mr. Taylor, and the marriage of the widow to Mill, . 100
Her death at Avignon, and the epitaph placed on her tomb, . . . 101
Her many exalted qualities, as described by Mill, ... 102
The great service she was to him in his literary enterprises, . . 99, 103
The part she had in his various works, ... 103–105

PAGE
MILL, MRS., in what way did she acquire all the knowledge she possessed? . 105
MIRACLES, the nature of, ... 161, 162
MONOGRAPHERS, White of Selborne on 17
MOORE, NORMAN, his high eulogium on Waterton not sustained by facts, 40, 42, 48, 49
His use of improper language when alluding to others, ... 48
MORMONISM, the hold it has on its followers, ... 53

NATURALISTS should be guided mainly by facts in their researches, . . 16
Generally men of humanity and intelligence, ... 18
Closet, Waterton's antipathy to, ... 42, 44, 47
NATURAL HISTORY, how researches should be conducted in, 3, 18, 28, 34, 36
Of man in his apostacy from God, ... *n*53
NATURAL RELIGION, see *Paganism.*
NOVELISTS, the general intellectual character of, ... 152

OPOSSUM, peculiarities of the, ... 19
OSTRICH, the, as described by Job, ... 23
OWL, peculiarities of the, ... *n*93

PAGANISM, the difficulty in converting a people from, ... 49
The sacrifices of the Gentiles, the prayer of Plato, and the sacrifice of Socrates, ... 51
Natural religion apparently the corruption of an original revelation, . 51
Natural religion, as described by St. Paul, ... 51
The difficulties attending the establishment of a religion, ... 52
St. Paul taken for a god on two occasions, ... 52, 54
The establishment of Mormonism, ... 53
Human Nature capable of setting up a worship of its own, ... 53
And converting a revelation into a religion of nature, ... 49, 53
Deification among the ancient Pagans, ... *n*53
The natural history of man in the matter of religion, ... *n*53
The religion of the Athenians, ... 58, 79, 82
Contrast between the claims of the priests of modern and ancient Rome, ... 59
Cicero on an ancestral religion, ... 59, 60, 66
Its foundation the authority of the priests and tradition, ... 59
Paganism in some respects tolerant, ... 59
Plutarch on the "agreeable things" connected with Paganism, . . 59
It could neither be attacked nor defended on the question of its origin, ... 60, *n*61
It rested entirely on "venerating the religion of its ancestors," . . 60
It gave to Romanists most of their peculiarities, ... 61
How it existed before and after the establishment of Christianity, . 62
The awe inspired by Pagan temples and religious groves, ... 65
The worship of Diana of the Ephesians, ... 65
The religions of ancient and modern Rome compared, ... 66
PALL MALL GAZETTE, THE, on the Gipsies, ... *n*160
PAN, Plato's prayer addressed to, ... 51

PAGE
PAN would not have been a god under certain circumstances, ... 111
PHILOSOPHERS, the great things they are to accomplish according to Mill, . 81
The want of common sense among many of them, ... 94
PIG, the, a great enemy to snakes, ... 19
How it fights the rattlesnake, ... 19
PLATO, his prayer to Pan, ... 51
On future punishment, ... 78
PLINY, the Consul, on the contemplation of death, ... 78
PLUTARCH on the idea of kissing a Pagan emperor's foot, ... *n*54
On the pleasant associations connected with the religion of Pagans, . 59
On the existence of God, ... 79
PONS ASINORUM, the, of the Gipsy question, ... *n*124
PROTESTANTS, the religion of, ... *n*60, 64
The power they have to encounter in Romanism, ... 62
PSALMIST, THE, on the mysteries of his being, ... 81

QUAKERS, how they keep themselves distinct from others, ... 162, 167
QUINTILIAN on the existence of God, ... 79
On the education of youth, ... 88
On common sense, and premature intellectual efforts, ... 88

RABBIT, the American, does not burrow, ... 20
REES' CYCLOPÆDIA on the rattlesnake swallowing her young, ... 26
RITUALISTS in the English Church, ... 51, *n*58
ROEBUCK, Mill's quarrel with, ... 96
ROMANISM :—The natural adherence of mankind to the religion of their ancestors, ... 49
Though springing from Christianity, a religion of corrupt human nature, 49
The way in which it is taught by the Church and its priests, . . . 49
The difficulties of Romanists shaking off the system, ... 50
In what it consists, ... 50
The absolute belief and submission of its devotees, ... 50
The dignity and power of the priesthood, ... 50
Their worldly position, ... 51
The miracles of the Apostles not attempted by the priests, ... 53
The fountain for the washing away of sins claimed by a priest, . . . 53
The scorn of St. Peter when refusing money to confer a Christian grace, 54
He commands people to pray to GOD for forgiveness, and raises Cornelius from the ground, ... 54
Refusal of divine honours by St. Paul, ... 54
The kissing of the Pope's foot, ... 54
The worship of the "saints" and of their "relics," 54
The foundation of the Church, ... 54
Peter as a foundation, ... 54
His character, ... 54
The aversion of Romanists to hear the Greek Church mentioned, . . 55
The Pope should be required to "prove his pedigree" on a variety of subjects, ... 55

PAGE

ROMANISM :—The natural perpetuation of a religion that has been established, 56
A scepticism that is common among Romanists, ... 56
The rearing of priests, ... 56
Sceptical and atheistical priests, ... 57
The light in which priests regard themselves and those around them, . 57
The confessional generally, ... 58
Peculiarities of priests, ... 58
The power of the priests of modern and ancient Rome compared, . 59
The absolute belief of Romanists under any circumstances, . . . 60
Christianity originated in a civilized age, and is based on facts, . . 60
The fight between it and Paganism, ... 61
A coalition formed, ... 61
Romanism borrowed most of its peculiarities from Paganism, . . 61
Romanism not Christianity, ... 61
The despotism of its priesthood, ... 61, *n*64
The historical foundation on which Romanism rests, ... *n*61
The foundation of corrupt Christianity like that of a human religion, . 62
Both can maintain themselves in the world, ... 62
The gradual growth of Romanism and the powers claimed by it, . . 62
Romanism as a power which Protestantism has to combat, . . . 62
Sincere and nominal Romanists, ... 63
The sincerity of the priests, ... 64
The peculiar training of Roman priests, ... 65, *n*90
The influence of the Romanist system over its votaries, ... 65
Its effects resemble, in some respects, those of the goddess Diana, . 65
The belief and practices of lay and clerical Romanists, ... 66
Comparison between Romanism and ancient Paganism, . . . 66
The extent to which Christianity has been corrupted by Romanism, . 66
The infallibility of the Pope, ... 67
The right of private judgment among Romanists, ... 67
The trouble which the Scriptures cause the Romanists, . . . 68
Passages in Scripture which the Pope should be called upon to interpret, 68
The second commandment set aside by Romanists, ... 68
Christ's words on the perpetuity of the moral law, ... 68

SATURDAY REVIEW, THE, on the disappearance of the Gipsies, ... *n*111
SCEPTICS seldom or never investigate the religion they object to, . . . 75
Their so-called religion, as described by Mill, ... 77
SCOTT, SIR WALTER, his opinion on the disappearance of the Gipsies, . . 114
On the difficulties in acquiring the language of the Gipsies, ... 124
SKUNK, singular peculiarity in the, ... 44
SNAKES, belligerency among, ... 7, 15, *n*15
Climbers and swimmers, ... 22, 30, 41, 42
Constrictors, ... 31, 41
Eggs, description of, ... 8, 10, 14, 26, 32
Fascinating birds, ... 30, 31, 40, 41
Feeding, ... 7, 11, 22, 27, 29, 31, 41
Hatching of their eggs, probable time required for, ... 20

PAGE

SNAKES hatched on a mantelpiece, and on a table, ... 7, 14
Holes, the use they make of, ... 10, 27, 29
Hybernating, ... 29
Incubators, ... 33, 43
Natural history of, how generally acquired, ... 16, 17, 26, 36
Nests, how made and found, ... 8, 15, 18–21, 31, 33
Oviparous, ... 7, 8, 12, 14, 34, 37, 38
Progeny, number of, ... 8, 11, 18, 19, 29, 31–34
Scriptural allusions to, ... 17, 31
Skins, shedding of their, ... 9, 22, 27, 41
Swallowing of their young, 7–9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 34, 35, 37, *n*39
Apparent mode of, ... 9, 10, 16, 24, 26, 36, 38
All snakes should be assumed to be "swallowers," . . 29, 38
Viviparous (so-called), ... *n*8, 12, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38
Water, ... 18
How their nests are built, ... 19
Young, how are they fed? 10, 16, 25
Seldom seen by themselves, ... 9, 15
When seen by themselves, ... 27
SOCRATES, his sacrifice to Æsculapius, ... 51
Man's ignorance regarding his origin, ... 76
On the existence of God, ... 79
SOUTHEY, ROBERT, on the policy of the Jesuits, ... *n*48
Styled Bunyan a "blackguard," 158
On Bunyan's education, ... 159
SPANISH GIPSIES, ... 123–127
ST. ANDREWS, Mill's legacy to the students of, ... 74
ST. PAUL on the laws of nature in the propagation of animals, ... 17
On godly sorrow and the sorrow of the world, ... *n*50
On people who are "ever learning," 51
The sacrifices of the Gentiles, and the religion of nature, ... 51
Taken for a god at Lystra, and in the Island of Malta, ... 52
On the delusion sent to the ungodly, ... 53, 67
His horror at having the divine honours of Pagans offered him, . . 54
His opposition to St. Peter, ... 55
On the religion of the Athenians, ... 58, 79, 82
On speaking in an unknown tongue, as applicable to the Pope's infallibility, ... 67
On the teaching and influence of the Holy Scriptures, ... 67
On the coming of Antichrist, ... 68
On the fear of death and future punishment, ... 78
On the Epicurean creed, ... 80
ST. PETER scorned to accept money to confer a Christian grace, ... 54
He commands people to pray to GOD for forgiveness, and raises Cornelius from the ground, ... 54
His character generally, ... 54
STANLEY, DEAN, on the confessional and the Eastern Churches, ... 61
Eulogizes Bunyan at Bedford, ... *n*161

PAGE

SUNSTROKE illustrated, ... 43
SURNAMES among the Gipsies, ... 121, 130

TOAD, the, eaten by snakes, ... 27
TORTOISES AND TURTLES, how they are generated, ... 33
The tortoise swallowed alive by the boa, ... 41

WATERTON, CHARLES, greatly in error in regard to snakes, . . . 39–42
Surrounds Walton Hall with a wall, for the sake of natural history, . 42
His writings full of errors in regard to natural history, . . . 42, 46
On sunstroke, ... 43
The pythoness hatching her eggs, ... 43
The skunk, ... 44
On wolves, ... 44
The apes on Gibraltar, ... 45
A description of his writings, ... 46, 48
Avows himself to be a Romanist, ... 47
On bird-stuffers, ... 47
On closet naturalists, ... 44, 47
His character as a naturalist, ... 42, 47, 48
Some peculiarities in his private character, ... 46, 47
His eulogium on the Jesuits, by whom he was educated, . . . 47
How he got the better of a Jesuit at Stonyhurst, ... *n*48
His complaint on being termed an unscientific naturalist, . . . 48
He was not a man of science in the proper sense of the word, . . 49
WESTMINSTER REVIEW, THE, on the Gipsies, ... *n*160
WHITE, GILBERT, of Selborne, on the propagation and feeding of snakes, . 10
His testimony regarding vipers swallowing their young, and viper-catchers, ... 11
Describes a viper pregnant with eggs, and another with young, . . 11
His theory regarding the hatching of vipers' eggs, . . 11, 12, 33
Was not apparently a scientific naturalist, ... *n*12
On monographers, ... 17
On the difficulties attending the formation of a natural history, . . 17
On the comparing of one animal to another by memory, . . . 18
As a man of candour, and open to conviction in regard to natural history, 19
On the genera of animals peculiar to America, ... 19
On the variety of the methods of Providence in natural history, . . 20
On the hatching of snakes' eggs, ... 20, 21
Was no bird-catcher or tamer, ... 20
On snakes shedding their skins, ... 22
Was not fond of analogous reasoning or theories, ... 22
WOLVES, how they hunt their prey, ... 44, 45
WORDSWORTH, the influence of his poetry on Mill, ... 96

ZINCALI SOCIETY, THE, in the city of New York, ... 141

APPENDIX.

I. JOHN BUNYAN AND THE GIPSIES.*

A WORK by myself, entitled *Contributions to Natural History and Papers on Other Subjects*, now in the hands of Edinburgh publishers, from stereotype plates sent from this side, was set up before I saw *Notes and Queries* of the 11th July last, which contains an article from Mr. Dudley Cary Elwes, on the parentage of John Bunyan. In that article Mr. Elwes writes:—

"As I was (by the courtesy of the vicar of the parish), inspecting the regter of *Wootton* parish, Co. Bedfordshire, I came across the following entries, which evidently allude to some of John Bunyan's ancestors, as Wootton is not so very far from Elstow—about five miles—and they may, perhaps, eventually lead to the discovery of who were his parents; they also do away with the supposition of those who think that John Bunyan may have had Gipsy blood in his veins."

And he gives a list of seven baptisms, four marriages, and five burials of people of the names of Bunnion and Bunion, between the years 1581 and 1645.

In *Notes and Queries* for 10th October, 1874, D. C. E. gives a list of many baptisms, marriages, and burials, principally under the name of Bonyon, from *Chalgrave* register, Co. Beds., between the years 1559 and 1629. And in John Camden Hotten's *Original list of Emigrants, etc., to the American Plantations*, (1874), we find—"John, son of John and Mary Bunnyon, bap. 16 October, 1679," taken from the register of Christ Church, Barbadoes.

In the *Sunday Magazine*, for January, 1875, I find the following:—

"The Rev. John Brown, of Bunyan meeting, has gone with great care into many of the old registers connected with the meeting and the parish, and has contrived to throw a good deal of light on several points regarding the 'Great Dreamer.' First of all, he finds that the idea of Bunyan being of Gipsy race, is totally discountenanced, which supposition might have been encouraged by the fact of Bunyan's trade being that of a tinker or travelling brazier, in which many Gipsies were engaged. He has discovered that though the name of Bunyan has now died out from Bedfordshire, it is of great antiquity, and was pretty common there under various forms of spelling. It was borne by people of good position."

And the writer quotes from *The Book of the Bunyan Festival*, as follows:—

"In the original accounts of the real and personal estates of delinquents seized by the Parliament of England, between the years 1642 and 1648, the rent of Sir George Bynnion, delinquent, in the parish of Eaton-Socon, Bedfordshire, is returned at £223, 11s. 4d. From the same account it appears that the land of Mr. Foster, delinquent, in the parish of Stretly, was let by the year to John Bunnyon, tenant, at a rent of £30. It is perhaps worthy of notice, that the farm of this John Bunnyon was not far from that village of Samsell, where our John Bunyan was apprehended for preaching. Were they kinsmen, and had the tinker been on a visit

* This article on "John Bunyan and the Gipsies," was sent to *Notes and Queries*, on the 3d March, 1875, and printed on the 27th. I have thought it advisable to insert it here, in its original form.

to his more prosperous relative when he fell into trouble? [!] Quite recently also it has been discovered that between October, 1581, and January, 1645, the name of Bunnion or Bunion occurs no less than sixteen times in the register of the parish church at Wootton, a village three or four miles from Elstow. There can be little doubt that these different modes of spelling are simply variations of the same name, and their long existence in the county effectually disposes of the supposition that the Bunyans were Gipsies."

From the above-mentioned notices of the Gipsies, as well as others scattered of late through *Notes and Queries*, it does not appear that the writers have made any real inquiries in regard to the subject, but merely to have set out with preconceived ideas, popular impressions, or suppositions and theories, and made their remarks dovetail into them. Now, what is wanted is a carefully considered investigation, starting from certain facts connected with the Gipsies, as they exist, such as:—

"1st. What constitutes a Gipsy in a settled or unsettled state? 2d. What should we ask a Gipsy to do to 'cease to be a Gipsy,' and become more a native of the country of his birth than he is already? 3d. In what relation does the race stand to others around it, with reference to intermarriage and the destiny of the mixed progeny, and that of the tribe generally?—An investigation of this kind would involve a search for so many facts, however difficult of being found; and should be conducted as....a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions or theories, or analogies not being allowed to form part of the testimony."—*Contributions, p.* 134.

Many who take an interest in this subject, and are doubtless desirous of getting to the bottom of it, and learning most of the facts of it, may not have the time or opportunities to investigate it; or they may not have the talents suitable for the business, or may find it difficult to get hold of the thread of it, so as to unravel it to the satisfaction of themselves and others. Such people I would refer to *Simson's History of the Gipsies*, edited by myself, and published by Sampson Low & Co., in 1865; a work of 575 pp., containing a minute index of all the information to be found in it. In the ordinary course of things, what is contained in this work would be commented on, admitted or rejected, so far as current ideas are concerned, and taken as the basis of future investigations. But the writers alluded to have apparently either never seen or heard of the book, and are therefore not "read up" on the subject they discuss; or they purposely ignore it, and so raise the question whether they are merely treating the subject to make a paragraph or maintain a theory. And that applies more particularly to the fact of Bynnion, Bunnyon, Bonyon, Bunnion or Bunion being a name not uncommon, in the seventeenth century, in Bedfordshire. Hence the two writers specially alluded to conclude in triumph, and perhaps with a flourish of trumpets, that John Bunyan could not possibly have been a Gipsy, for the reason that others of the British race were of the same name! and, as a corollary, that no one bearing a British name can, under any circumstances, be a Gipsy! The two gentlemen mentioned seem to know very little, if anything, of the subject, and should have exhausted every source of information, and looked at every side of the question, before so dogmatically asserting that they "do away with the supposition of those who think that John Bunyan may have had Gipsy blood in his veins;" that "the idea of Bunyan being of Gipsy race, is totally discountenanced," and that the long existence of the name in the county, "effectually disposes of the supposition that the Bunyans were Gipsies"

The question is, When, and for

what purpose, and under what circumstances, did the Gipsies assume the Christian and surnames of Great Britain and Europe generally? The natural answer is that it was to protect themselves against the severity of the laws passed against them. A tribal tradition (as distinguished from a private family one) on a subject of that kind would be easily and accurately handed down from so recent a time as Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. Now, the tradition among all the British Gipsies is that their British names were originally assumed from those of people of influence, among whom the tribe settled, as they scattered over the country, and had districts assigned to them, under chieftains, with a king over all, and tokens or passes to keep each in his district, or from infringing on the rights of other families. All that is fully explained in *Simson's History of the Gipsies* (pp. 116, 117, 205, and 218), where will also be found (p. 206) the fancy the tribe have always had for terming themselves "braziers," and having the word put on their tombstones. And how a person can, in the most important sense of the word, be a Gipsy, with blue eyes and fair hair, as well as black, no matter what his character or habits, calling or creed may be, is also very elaborately explained in the same work. And that anticipated Mr. James Wyatt, who said, in *Notes and Queries*, on the 2d January last, that John Bunyan could not have been a Gipsy, owing to his personal appearance, as he was

"Tall of stature, strong-boned, with sparkling eyes, wearing his hair on the upper lip after the old British fashion, his hair reddish, but in his latter days sprinkled with grey; his nose well cut, his mouth not too large, his forehead something high, and his habit always plain and modest."

To the *History of the Gipsies*, and to the forthcoming *Contributions*—in both of which Mr. Borrow is very fully reviewed—all parties inquiring about the Gipsies and John Bunyan are referred.

The discovery of Bunyan (with a variety in the spelling), having been the name of native families, is interesting, and shows how superficial previous inquiries must have been. I was under the impression that the Bunyan family had brought it into England with them; but admitting that it was assumed by them, it still holds good that

"Very likely there was not a drop of common English blood in Bunyan's veins. John Bunyan belongs to the world at large, and England is only entitled to the credit of the formation of his character."—*Contributions, p.* 159.

The name of Bunyan having been borne by native families would not, under any circumstances, even make it probable that John Bunyan was *not* a Gipsy, for there is a great variety of native names among the race. Had he belonged to the native race, he could have said that he was, in all probability, of a "fine old Saxon family in reduced circumstances, related to a baronet and many respectable families." In place of that he said:—

"For my descent, it was, *as is well known to many*, of a low and inconsiderable generation, my father's house being of that rank that is *meanest* and *most despised* of *all* the families of the land."

At this time it was death by law for being a Gipsy, and "felony without benefit of clergy" for associating with them, and odious to the rest of the population. Besides telling us that his descent was "well known to many," he added:—

"Another thought came into my mind, and that was, whether we [his family and relations] were of the Israelites or no; for finding in the Scriptures that they were once the peculiar people of God, thought I, if I were one of this race [how significant is the expression!]

my soul must needs be happy. Now, again, I found within me a great longing to be resolved about this question, but could not tell how I should. At last I asked my father of it, who told me, No, we [his father included] were not."

Language like this is pregnant with meaning when used by a man who

"Was simply a Gipsy of mixed blood, who must have spoken the Gipsy language in great purity; for considering the extent to which it is spoken in England to-day, we can well believe that it was very pure two centuries ago, and that Bunyan might have written works even in that language."—*Contributions, p.* 159.—"It would be interesting to have an argument in favour of the common native hypothesis. . . . . In the face of what Bunyan said of himself, it is very unreasonable to hold that he was not a Gipsy, but a common native, when the assumption is all the other way. Let neither, however, be assumed, but let an argument in favour of both be placed alongside of the other to see how the case would look."—*Ib., p.* 160.

In the forthcoming *Contributions* an effort is made to have the subject of the Gipsies placed on a right foundation, and the race, in its various mixtures of blood and positions in life, openly acknowledged by the world; John Bunyan taking his place "as the first (that is known to the world) of eminent Gipsies, the prince of allegorists, and one of the most remarkable of men and Christians."

The remarks I have made about two writers in particular are not altogether inapplicable to Mr. A. Fergusson, United Service Club, Edinburgh, who wrote thus, in *Notes and Queries*, on 19th December, 1874, on "Gipsy Christian names and tombs":—

"The ideas of most people, however, on the subject, derived chiefly from sensational novels and the mystified tales of George Borrow, are, I imagine, still rather hazy."

However, I give him, as follows, in answer to his inquiry, copies of inscriptions on two Gipsy tombstones in the cemetery of Grove Church, in North Bergen township, on the edge of Union Hill, in New Jersey, opposite to New York:—

Neat upright marble tablet, with a weeping willow, partly covering a monument, carved on the surface:—

IN
MEMORY OF
NAOMI DAVIS,
WHO DIED MARCH 4, 1855,
AGED 22 YEARS.

Farewell father, mother, husband and son,
Don't weep for me although I am gone;
Don't weep for me, nor neither cry,
I trust to meet my God on high.
"The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away,
Blessed be the name of the Lord."

On a smaller upright marble monument, within the enclosure, formed by a chain and marble supports, a little out of order, there is the following, to the memory of her sister:—

VASHTI, WIFE OF T. WORTON, DIED
NOV. 26, 1851, Æ. 26 YR.

This family and some of their connections I was well acquainted with. I found them of various mixtures of blood; some with the Gipsy features and colour strongly marked, and others bearing no resemblance to the tribe. They all spoke the language. One of the sons-in-law was a half-caste Scotch Hindoo from Bombay. They did not have much education, but were naturally intelligent, and smart and 'cute.*

In addition to the investigations made in church registers, I would suggest that the records of the different criminal courts in Bedfordshire, (if they still exist) should be examined, to find if people of the name of Bunyan (and how designated) are found to have been on trial, and for what offences.

* This was an English Gipsy family.

*II.—MR. FRANK BUCKLAND AND WHITE OF SELBORNE.**

ON looking over Mr. Buckland's edition of *White's Natural History of Selborne*, I find some strange remarks made by him on the question alluded to by White, whether vipers, on the approach of danger, swallow their young. White himself was the very embodiment of dignity and simplicity, candour and courtesy, and was open to conviction on every question relating to natural history, let the information come from whatever direction it might. Thus he said:—

"Monographers, come from whence they may, have, I think, fair pretence to challenge some regard and approbation from the lovers of natural history." "Men that undertake only one district are much more likely to advance natural knowledge than those that grasp at more than they can possibly be acquainted with." "Candour forbids me to say absolutely that any fact is false because I have never been witness to such a fact."

Mr. Buckland, when discussing the question, should have presented in a condensed form the *pro* and *con* of it, and given his own conclusion, so that the reader could have formed an estimate of his judgment and of the subject generally. In place of that, he has not, even in the most distant manner, alluded to the affirmative side of the question, nor suggested how the idea could have arisen, or how it happens that so many intelligent people maintain it as a fact personally known to themselves. The course adopted by him was not for want of information, for (not to speak of many others) he had a number of articles from myself in *Land and Water*, and others, in his possession for several months, which did not appear in that journal, but which were again laid before him in a work published last year under the title of *Contributions to Natural History, and Papers on other Subjects*. In that work I said, in regard to snakes swallowing their young, that

"I consider the testimony so complete that nothing could be added to it, although it would be very interesting to have a careful examination of the anatomy of the snake to ascertain the physical peculiarities connected with the phenomenon described" (p. 3).

"As in mathematics we require to know some things to demonstrate others; so in snakes swallowing their young it is not necessary for a man of science or common sense, if he will but exercise it, to see it done in order to believe it; but when ocular testimony is added, it sets the question at rest beyond all doubt. The next thing to be considered is the anatomy of the snake immediately after the birth of her progeny; but that could not be so easily ascertained as that she swallows them" (p. 38).

"I am not aware of the throat of a snake having been examined to see whether it could allow an instant passage for her young. . . . If a throat were examined, it should be that of a snake that was alleged or supposed to have swallowed her progeny" (p. 26). "It will be difficult to find this passage unless when it is in use, for it will become so contracted at other times as to escape any observation that is not very minutely made" (p. 36).

That evidence I have not seen

* This and the following article were offered, unsuccessfully, to some English publications. I give them in the original form, that they may carry more weight, or be more interesting, than if they had been specially got up for the use they are now put to, although they will present the appearance of a repetition of some of the ideas and facts given.

impeached by any one. Part of it consisted of a paper read by Professor G. Brown Goode, of the University of Middletown, Connecticut, before the Science Convention at Portland, in the State of Maine, in 1873, which furnished evidence from nearly a hundred people from many parts of the United States; several gentlemen present testifying of their own knowledge to the fact of snakes swallowing their young, particularly Professor Sydney J. Smith, of the Sheffield Scientific School, Yale College, who "added to the testimony of the paper his personal evidence, that he had seen 'with his own eyes' young snakes entering and issuing from the mouth of an older one."

Mr. Buckland brings forward no evidence whatever in support of himself and his friends as "anti-swallowers." What he says amounts virtually to this, that what he and they do not know, or do not understand, has no existence in fact! The twelve verses of the song, to the tune of Lord Lovel, composed by Mr. Henry Lee, in connection with himself and Mr. Higford Burr, in attempted derision of "swallowers," has no bearing on the question at issue. He, indeed, advances Mr. Davy, the bird-catcher and dealer, who and whose employès never saw a viper swallow her young, and *therefore* pronounce the idea a "story of Old Mother Hubbard!" He also quotes Mr. Holland, the keeper of the snakes at the Zoological Gardens, who never saw it done in his collection of snakes; from which Mr. Buckland infers that the idea is a romance. I attach no weight to what Mr. Davy says; but Mr. Holland is entitled to a particular notice. I would ask him if he knows *for certainty* how vipers are born. If he finds that the mother passes the young in the shape of an egg or ball, about the size of a blackbird's egg, when they immediately disengage themselves from the covering after it has touched the ground, how can he find a viper full of young, upwards of seven inches long, and so active as to instantly fight or run, unless they afterwards entered her by the mouth? Like Mr. Davy, the bird-man, he will doubtless scratch his head and cry, "Old Mother Hubbard!" Most likely both gentlemen's knowledge is limited to their own observations, and, like such people generally, they are poor judges of what has been observed by others under different circumstances. Thus Mr. Holland concludes that vipers do not, and therefore cannot, swallow their young while in a state of nature, because they do not do it while in captivity —a most illogical conclusion. His vipers have either been born in captivity, or become reconciled to it through time, so that their house, cage, or den is the only place of safety they know of. And for what purpose would a viper swallow her young under these circumstances? It could not be to carry them anywhere, or shield them from the weather, or protect them against danger that was avoidable; the last being the reason always given by people who have seen the phenomenon. This I explained in *Land and Water*, when I also met the objection of the viper-catchers.

It would be interesting to be told by Mr. Buckland how *viviparous* snakes are actually born. He cuts open a viper, and finds inside a string or necklace of eggs about an inch in length. Further on in the season he cuts open another viper, and finds the same number (as it may be) of young, upwards of seven inches long, complete and active snakes, lying all sorts of ways, *with no remains of the eggs*. He says that these have not yet been born; whereas, in fact, they had previously been born in the way described, and had returned to the same chamber by the mouth. An assumption

or supposition of Mr. Buckland on a point like this amounts to nothing. It would also be interesting if he would tell us what animals are *not* covered. or partly covered, with something, however slight, when they come into the world. If he finds, as a matter of fact, that vipers are born singly, in the open air, *with a covering on them*, how can he possibly resist the conclusion that those found inside of a mother, as described, had entered her by the mouth? That there may be no question on this point, we find in America that *oviparous* snakes are found with young inside of them which were hatched in the soil; the young having been seen to run in and run out by people whose evidence it would be out of the question to dispute.

Mr. Buckland's ideas on this subject are very hazy and vague. Thus a writer in *Land and Water*, on the 27th of September, 1873, said that a gentleman killed a viper, and "observing it to be of unusual thickness about the middle, he put his foot upon the place, thinking that the reptile had recently swallowed a mouse. The pressure brought out *ten* young vipers from the mouth of the old one. Some of them were about five inches long, and some shorter; but all were alive and active, as if they had previously seen the light of day, and had again sought shelter in the parent." Mr. Buckland admitted all this, but maintained that the young had not been born, but were *squeezed* out of the *mouth!*—a rather strange phenomenon for the young inside of an egg or covering to be forced out of the *mouth*, in the direction of which, according to Mr. Buckland's theory, there is no passage. One would naturally think that the pressure of the foot would have converted the contents of the mother into a jelly, or forced them out towards the *tail*, rather than produced a "stream of viperlings" from her *mouth*, "alive and active," as described.* On the 14th of August, 1875, he was informed of an officer of the 77th Regiment killing a viper with "young ones alive inside." To that Mr. Buckland replied:—

> "To say that a viper has swallowed its young because they are found inside it, is as logical as to state that because a lot of kittens are found alive in a mother cat, therefore the cat had swallowed them."

From this one would conclude, that snakes do not swallow their young because cats do not do it! "There is nothing extraordinary in finding live baby vipers inside the mother; but they were not, and never had been, inside the stomach proper." As if any one had ever asserted that, or imagined that Nature was such a botch as to permit the young to get mixed up with the entrails or vital organs! "They were by the side of the stomach, each wrapt up in a thin delicate membrane" (the remains of the original egg), as indeed they were before they were born; but these were divested of the membrane, and, as it were, "running about" inside, as can be found in a viper any summer in England.

Another strange thing to be noticed in Mr. Buckland's notes on *White*, besides not admitting a single word in opposition to his *theory* as distinguished from the *fact* of snakes swallowing their young, is, that he does not admit of White's own evidence, which was complete, excepting that he did not tell us (because he says he did not know) how vipers are born. White wrote thus of vipers:—

> "Though they are oviparous, yet they are viviparous also, hatching their young within their bellies, and then bringing them forth."

In supporting this assertion, it would have been interesting had he

* For the particulars of this phenomenon see note at page 39.

given us his authority. Like others, before and since, he evidently concluded that, as some vipers are killed pregnant with eggs and others with young, the latter must have been, and therefore were, hatched inside. His real knowledge was illustrated when he said that "the reptiles, few as they are, I am not acquainted with so well as I could wish with regard to their natural history. There is a degree of dubiousness and obscurity attending the propagation of this class of animals." Then he says:—

"Several intelligent folks assure me that they have seen the viper open her mouth and admit her helpless young down her throat on sudden surprises;"

whereas Mr. Buckland writes thus:—

"It is still believed by many that a female viper will swallow her young when they are in peril. In nearly all the cases [he does not explain the exceptions] that have come under my examination, the event always happened a long time ago. The witness generally begins his statement thus:—'When I was a little boy,' 'Many years ago,' 'My grandmother told me,' &c., &c. If vipers swallowed their young 'many years ago,' why should they not do so in our time?"

And he adds with a pooh, pooh air, as if he had noticed a crow flying past a window:—

"A correspondence on this subject takes place in *Land and Water* almost every year,"

while all the evidence furnished, including my own and that of the American Science Convention, as already explained, and the evidence to be drawn from other sources, has been passed by as if it had no value, or even existence. Presuming on something or other, whatever it may be, he thus carries things with a very high hand, riding rough-shod over every kind of evidence—quite unlike a man of superior character, intellect, and acquirements.

In his defence he says:—

"I have made many anatomical preparations to show that the young vipers found inside the mother have never been born."

It would certainly be interesting to have these examinations minutely described, but divested of technical phrases, so as to make them perfectly intelligible to the ordinary reader, and in which nothing is assumed, but everything proved, or logically and elaborately argued, if it cannot admit of proof.* He further says:—

"I still continue my public offer of a reward of £1 for a specimen of a viper which has been seen to swallow its young, *the young being actually in the œsophagus, or in the stomach proper*, when it is opened by me in the presence of witnesses."

The words underlined by him will prevent him being ever called upon to pay the pound, for young snakes do not enter that part of the mother, but take refuge in the chamber that contained the eggs, and that lies by the side or in front of the stomach, and extends below it, if my memory serves me correctly. There might be danger in taking the pound in the event of Mr. Buckland buying a "pig in a bag," and laying his "subject" aside to suit his convenience in having it dissected in the presence of his witnesses, who must be called together; for he could have the countryman arrested for obtaining money on false pretences, on the plea that the young had not been swallowed; for, had they been swallowed, they would have been in the stomach, and not in the chamber! And he

* It was evidently in reply to this request that Mr. Buckland gave, in *Land and Water*, a wood cut illustration of "a viper supposed to have swallowed its young," as alluded to in the following article.

might even get Messrs. Lee and Burr, and others of that "way," to back him and *prove* his case before many a "justice," unless the unfortunate man stumbled over some "vagabond attorney" who was "up to snakes," and stretched them all on the rack of the cross-question, and completely *floored* or *dished* the prosecution, and immediately began an action for false imprisonment and slander. If the applicant for the pound waited to see the result of the examination before getting his money, he might be turned out like a dog for having insulted the *savants*, notwithstanding his most solemn asseverations that he actually saw the viper swallow her brood, in whatever part of her they might be found.

This "offer" of Mr. Buckland, however meaningless it is in its nature and indelicate in its appeal to naturalists, has been well circulated for years back, and will be so for the future, unless the press should say, "Stop that advertisement," till he does the following:—*1st*, That he should give his examinations of vipers which he says showed that the young had never been born; *2d*, that he should tell the world how vipers, as a matter of fact, are born; and, *3d*, that if he finds they are born "singly, in the open air, *with a covering on them*, how can he possibly resist the conclusion that those found inside of a mother, as described, had entered her by the mouth?" This Mr. Buckland can easily do, since it rests with himself; whereas *his* offer is addressed to every one, and what is everybody's business is nobody's business.*

* Thus far of this article I offered to a London natural history publication, with the request that it might be returned if not accepted; and it came back, with every courtesy on the part of the editor. The remainder of the article was sent to another London journal that should certainly have printed it, but took no notice of it, as I shall mention at p. 198.

In *White's Natural History of Selborne*, published by Bickers & Son (1875), we have the original text, and the original notes marked G. W., so that the work, as it came from the hands of the author, stands out clearly from remarks made by others. Judged by this standard, Mr. Buckland's edition is an amazing production, which it would be difficult to characterize in becoming language. He disposes of White's notes as follows:—13 (some of them considerably mangled) are embodied in the text; 24 (not always copied correctly) are used as notes, with nothing to distinguish them from his own (of which he has about 30); and 24 are entirely suppressed. The language of the text is changed to incorporate the notes with it; and other liberties have been taken, but to what extent can only be ascertained by collating the two publications, which would be the more troublesome, owing to the letters being arranged differently from those in the original edition. The changes that may have been made are not likely to improve the language, if we judge from Mr. Buckland's Preface. White's *Observations on Nature* have been omitted, and in their place about a third of them, without any explanation given, have been inserted in brackets in the body of some of the letters, and in the most clumsy way; the word *Observations* being placed *outside* of the brackets, and sometimes omitted. Quotation marks have been left out when they should appear; and occasionally Mr. Buckland's *own* remarks printed, with nothing excepting the sense to distinguish them from White's text. In this way he breaks in upon the genius and beauty of the work—a charmingly desultory production, in which we can never imagine what even the next paragraph is likely to be; frequently the same subjects being alluded to again and again, exactly as they were written from time

to time; while the interest attaching to the *Observations*, and most of the *Observations* themselves, as well as the *Summary of the Weather*, have been entirely done away with. Translations of Latin quotations have been printed as part of the text, and various Latin documents excluded from the *Antiquities*. Perhaps Mr. Buckland is the only man in England who would so treat such a book—an inheritance which every one should regard with reverence. He has shown a singular peculiarity of judgment and sense of responsibility in so "editing" it.

With no references in the text, of which they are, or are supposed to be, illustrations, he adds 134 pages of notes, a very large part of which, however interesting most of them are, bear no relation whatever to White's matter, but would be suitable for a collection of illustrations, odds and ends, or scraps in natural history; and it would not be amiss to consign large parts of most of the remaining notes to the same repository; while there are a great many nice points in various branches of natural history that have not been commented on at all, and 45 pages that have no notes of any kind. It is to be sincerely hoped that Mr. Buckland's book will pass at its true value, and never be allowed to corrupt the text of the amiable White; for it is only the *Natural History of Selborne* altered, mixed and mutilated, and at the best only a part, although the most part, of what has hitherto passed under that name. Mr. Buckland says that "White's *Selborne* has held its own as a standard book for a hundred years, and will probably be as fresh as ever a hundred years hence;" but it must be as White left it, with additions distinguished from the original matter.

White was a man that doubtless brooded over the books he read on his favourite subjects. In regard to that Mr. Buckland says, that

"I have discovered that White had not only deeply studied Derham and also Ray, but [that] in many cases he illustrates [illustrated] Derham's arguments by his own observations."

As if his work does not sufficiently "discover" that; for in it we find Ray mentioned at least forty times, and Derham frequently alluded to.

Mr. Buckland also says:—

"We live in a beautiful and happy world. . . . . Rest assured that if we, like White, love animals (commonly called dumb because we cannot understand their language), we shall never experience the feeling of solitude."

That is running natural history into the ground. The world wants a "philosophy of life" deeper and more complex than that; natural history, in any of its branches, contributing to it according to people's opportunities and tastes running, or being cultivated, in that direction.

III.—MR. FRANK BUCKLAND ON THE VIPER.

IN the *Dublin University Magazine* for July, 1875, appeared a notice of *Contributions to Natural History and Papers on Other Subjects*, in which I find the following:—

"The principal articles in this volume that have reference to natural history, originally appeared in *Land and Water*." "For instance, it is a vexed question whether, under any circumstances, the young retreat into the stomach of the mother snake. A great authority [?], Mr. Frank Buckland, affirms that they do not; while our author is as positive that they do. And he certainly, with

reason, contends that the question is entirely one of evidence; and, therefore, should be settled 'as a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions, or theories not being allowed to form part of the testimony.'" "In support of his own views, Mr. Simson has collected a large body of evidence that undoubtedly appears authentic and conclusive."

In all I have read of Mr. Buckland's writings on this subject, I have seen no evidence in support of his assertion that vipers do *not* swallow their young. He merely maintains the negative, and produces others like himself who do not know of it, and *therefore* do not believe in the phenomenon, and says that it is impossible; but he has never told us *how* he knows that vipers do not swallow their young, and *why* it is impossible.

The question must occur to any one, how did the idea that vipers (as well as other snakes) swallow their young originate? A subject of that kind never could have become a superstition among country people. It has been simply a matter of observation. As such, it is not to be settled by a denial, for in that case one's ignorance would be the standard by which it would be measured, or the scales in which it would be weighed.

The truth is, Mr. Buckland has committed himself so frequently, so fully, and so publicly on this subject, that it becomes a difficult matter to "go back on" himself. That I can easily understand, as well as that he should say nothing about the matter; but I cannot so easily reconcile it with the "law of literature" that he should continue asserting a negative, and ignoring every kind of evidence against his *theory*, as he did lately in his edition of *White's Natural History of Selborne*, after being in possession of *Contributions* both before and after publication, saying nothing of the evidence to be drawn from other sources. In regard to that work he (or *Land and Water* for him) says:—

"*Contributions to Natural History, etc.* The fact that the natural history papers in this volume made their appearance in the first instance in these columns is an effectual bar to our offering any opinion on their merits. . . . . Of the first half we have already said we can offer no opinion."

To this I replied that

"All of the natural history papers were sent to this journal, but only about half of them, as the work plainly shows, were published in it; and these did not include the most important on the viper question. They were all intended for Mr. Buckland, in his usual manner, to comment on them, and admit or reject the evidence contained in them."

Mr. Buckland has always shirked the evidence to prove that vipers *do* swallow their young, and has become "a bar in the way" to its taking its place as a fact in natural history. The question is a very simple one that is of easy solution if we consider it according to evidence, direct as well as circumstantial; and it is strange that it should have been allowed to remain unsettled for a century, since White of Selborne brought it into prominent notice.

Mr. Buckland's last contribution to the discussion presents the subject in an aspect that makes it, I think, of considerable popular interest.

In *Land and Water*, of the 2d of September, 1876, he gives a woodcut illustration of "a viper supposed to have swallowed its young." His definition is correct enough, for no one but himself and his "school" would have *supposed* such a thing. The fact is that the young there described had never been born, and consequently could neither have run into nor out of the mother, especially as he says that each was "wrapped up in a very fine skin or membrane, tender as silver paper," (the

remains of the original egg), which shows that they had "never yet been born," but that "in a very short time the young vipers, as drawn, would have been born."

I can easily believe Mr. Buckland when he says that he has lost the friendship of a gentleman, who would not speak to him, because he asserted that vipers do not swallow their young; for he (Mr. B.) did so (very probably in the most offensive manner, and) in palpable ignorance of the point in dispute; an ignorance which apparently no fact or argument will remove from his mind, or get him to acknowledge. He admits that in England, Wales, and Scotland, one-half of the people believe that "a viper does habitually swallow its young, while the other half are totally incredulous." He does not account for either phenomenon, although he says that "for something like thirty years I have been endeavouring to settle this point." For this reason the subject should be taken out of his hands, as a person incompetent of treating it. He gives no reason for half of the population being "totally incredulous" on this subject, but leaves us to say that they are wilfully so, or because they have never had it fairly explained to them. That the other half are "swallowers" is because, according to Mr. Buckland's long rigmarole, they are under the influence of myths, superstitions, etc.—a very high compliment to pass upon half of the inhabitants of that Island called Great Britain.

As regards the direct evidence to the swallowing, he says:—

"I can recollect but one man only—a game-keeper—who could affirm that he had positively seen it,"

whereas White of Selborne wrote:—

"Several intelligent folks assure me that they have seen the viper open her mouth and admit her helpless young down her throat on sudden surprises."*

And yet Mr. Buckland adds that in his

"Humble opinion those who state they have seen vipers run down the mother's throat are perfectly honest in their belief, but yet not accurate as to facts. The story is generally to this effect:—They have seen the viper basking in the sun with the young ones around her; on being alarmed the old viper opens her mouth, and the young ones scuttle away."

One would think that that would settle the question, for he does not say how these people could be mistaken in what they saw with their own eyes, and not those of others; but he continues:—

"The viper is then killed, pressed with the foot, or opened with a knife, and the young are found inside the *stomach*, all alive oh!"

Such people, most likely, used the word *stomach* here, not distinguishing between the stomach proper and the chamber described in the engraving, in which the young take refuge. Mr. Buckland does not say that he ever dissected *such* a viper, and found the young "wrapped up in a very fine skin or membrane, tender as silver paper." Had he known more of the subject, or been willing to be informed of it by others, he would have referred to White of Selborne, who personally cut open a viper containing, not unborn vipers, coiled up in an egg or covering, about the size of a blackbird's egg, but *fifteen* exceedingly belligerent reptiles, the shortest of them being fully seven inches long—a phenomenon that can be observed any summer in England. But he examined *another* viper

* White's definition of the phenomenon is apparently more correct than the shorter one, "swallowing," in common use.

pregnant with eggs, near the point of hatching or birth, and says:—

"In the engraving will be found a drawing by Mr. Bergeau, the artist, giving a representation of a viper that has been *supposed* to have swallowed its young."

He here finds young that had not been born, and gives that as a triumphant reason that vipers do not swallow their young! He might have dissected various vipers, showing eggs ranging from the condition in which the fœtus could not be discovered with the naked eye, to the time of birth, and said that these dissections prove the same thing!

A scientific, or even common-sense, naturalist will not necessarily stoop so low as to demand ocular proof of snakes swallowing their young. He ascertains that vipers pass their young with a covering on them—the original egg attenuated to the last degree—which breaks as it leaves the mother, or immediately after it touches the ground; and are killed with young inside of them, sometimes upwards of seven inches long, and divested of a covering; and he concludes at once that the young were swallowed. And his opinion is confirmed by the fact of *oviparous* snakes being killed with young inside of them that were hatched in the soil, which proves beyond doubt that they must have been swallowed. Ocular testimony confirms the opinion in *both* instances that the young were swallowed.

As I have already said, about half of *Contributions to Natural History* appeared in *Land and Water*, and the other half were in Mr. Buckland's possession for several months before publication. Among these last was a paper read by Prof. G. Brown Goode, before the American Science Convention, in 1873, in which was found the positive evidence of nearly a hundred people, from various parts of the United States, as to *various kinds of snakes* swallowing their young; several scientific gentlemen present testifying of their own knowledge to the fact, particularly Prof. Sydney J. Smith, of the Sheffield Scientific School, Yale College, who "added to the testimony of the paper his personal evidence that he had seen, *with his own eyes*, young snakes entering and issuing from the mouth of an older one." He was also in possession of an appendix to the work, bearing the title of *Mr. Frank Buckland and White of Selborne*, that answered by anticipation all that he has advanced in his article under review. All the evidence contained in these counted for nothing in Mr. Buckland's estimation. He says that "for something like thirty years" he has been labouring to ascertain whether or not vipers swallow their young; so that we have his own evidence to satisfy us that during all that time he has been merely trifling with the subject.

In his edition of *White's Natural History of Selborne* Mr. Buckland, as we have seen, says that "a correspondence on this subject takes place in *Land and Water* almost every year." This was illustrated by J. A. D., on the 16th of December, 1876, when he said that he saw a viper swallow her young; and on the same day by Wm. G. Gard, who said:—

"I can be under no delusion whatever about the case. I *saw* the mother and young ones; I *saw* the young ones enter her mouth; and I *saw* them released from her stomach by its being ripped open by my father, and I *saw* them killed."

On the 30th Francis Edwards testified to the phenomenon having been seen by Isaac Mitchell, a farm labourer; and on the 6th of January, 1877, Mr. Gard, in reply to some meaningless cavilling of "Lawyer C." about the fact being "im-

probable," and asking how the little vipers breathe, and how the digestion of the old one acts (Mr. Buckland's heresy), said :—

"I again assert that I saw the young ones swallowed; and it matters not after this whether the releasing of them from the inside of the mother was skilfully or otherwise performed; nor can any amount of special pleading on the part of 'Lawyer C.' in any way affect that fact."

Facts like these can be ascertained any summer in England, in opposition to Mr. Buckland's assertion that they are "grandmothers' stories," and "tales of Old Mother Hubbard." At the end of Mr. Gard's remarks Mr. Buckland said that "the discussion must now close." It should certainly close with the affirmative, that vipers *do* swallow their young, on evidence direct as well as circumstantial, and "as a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions, or theories not being allowed to form part of the testimony."

In the form of a prefatory note to the preceding article, entitled *Mr. Frank Buckland and White of Selborne*, printed and extensively circulated in Great Britain, as an appendix to the book, was the following :—

"It is to be hoped that this subject will be well ventilated in England, where there are so many publications that take more or less notice of natural history. Mr. Buckland being in the way should prove no bar to that being done; for it is a question with many, What is *his* real standing as a naturalist?

"In his treatment of the matter in dispute, he has ignored every circumstance, argument, and fact bearing on the affirmative side of it, and has had recourse to the ignorance of others, and a song, instead of hard facts and solid reasons, in support of it. Since he has committed himself so fully to the question at issue, judgment must be given against him by default in the event of his not making good, or not explaining, the challenge he has had before the world for years back.

"His surroundings in England make it a difficult matter to 'bring him to justice' on this question, in the ordinary way. Appropriate parts of the accompanying article were offered to two journals there, but were declined—for reasons which I and others may imagine, but cannot state."

I have not noticed that even one paper there took Mr. Buckland to task for "altering, mixing, and mutilating" the text of White, and inserting all kinds of frivolous matter in the work, such as the song to the tune of Lord Lovel, phrases like "grandmothers' stories" and "tales of Old Mother Hubbard," and remarks in keeping with what he lately wrote to the *Times*, when, in speaking of the destruction of oyster spat, he said :—

"I think then what an awful slaughter of oyster-mothers and babies has been carried on during the last two or three weeks in London alone. Why, it is worse than the Turkish atrocities!"

This tone, indeed, runs through most of his writings, where it may remain, but it is sadly out of place in *White's Natural History of Selborne.*

The only journal which really called Mr. Buckland to account in any way, that I know of, is the *Examiner*, long afterwards, that is, on the 2d February, 1878, when, in reviewing *Professor Bell's Edition of White*, it wrote rather gingerly as follows :—

"Of a later edition [than that of Bennett], by another hand, [that is, Mr. Buckland], we need say nothing; it has already succumbed under its own presumptuous inefficiency."

I have nothing to say of Mr. Buckland personally, but I claim

the privilege of speaking of him in his public capacity, since he is "a bar in the way"—the cause of unnecessary trouble—in having the question of the viper swallowing her young admitted as a fact in natural history. And he and his friends can have no reason of complaint against me for doing so, inasmuch as he has treated the subject capriciously, and not with that candour and courtesy which the "sacred deposit of truth" called for.

My opinion, then, of him is that he is a wonderfully overrated man, but in high esteem in England among conventional people who, even although of high education and intelligence, are not qualified to judge him in questions of natural history, or who have never heard his merits discussed, or who will not take the trouble to look into them, and will almost resent it being done by others. In reality he is, for the most part, but a kind of broker in natural history facts and anecdotes—almost every one sending him all kinds of articles and odds and ends connected with the subject, of which he becomes the depositary and registrar, to be referred to as occasion calls for. In this capacity he would be a useful and interesting member of society, if he accurately arranged and thoroughly digested his information, and dealt it out correctly, giving his authorities, after their information had been well tested and confirmed, for everything with which he favoured the public, so that it could always be depended on. And then his labours would be too multifarious to secure accuracy on all occasions. In denying that Charles Waterton was a *scientific* naturalist I said that

"A person may make all observations possible on a complicated subject, and yet be devoid of the capacity or mental training to weave them into a theory or system, that will immediately, or at any time, meet with acceptance" (p. 49).

The same may be asserted, in a much greater degree, of the relation in which Mr. Buckland stands to natural history generally (for it is almost the reverse of Waterton's), whatever might be said of him as a taxidermist and anatomist (the labours of his own hands), or in any particular department of natural history that he may have practically studied to advantage. Witness, for example, his amazing remarks, given at page 189, about a "stream of viperlings, alive and active, forced out of a viper by the pressure of the foot," being "in the egg and not yet born, but squeezed out of the *mouth*"; and that *vipers* do not swallow their young because *cats* do not do it! Could a "naturalist," with the overwhelming amount of evidence before him, ever have given expression to two such opinions?

The son of, and "the successor in natural science" to, the Dean of Westminster, the well-known Bridgewater writer, lately a surgeon in the Life Guards, the natural history editor of *Land and Water*, and the leading commissioner of the fisheries—preceded by his page and secretary—Mr. Buckland presents an imposing aspect to all kinds of "poor people," who would rather not offend him, or the society in which he figures so prominently, and far less call in question his authority or almost his infallibility in natural history. So divided and subdivided is the press, with its various spheres so clearly defined, that journals whose province is not natural history will not interfere with him in disputed points, but will rather say, "We leave that to Mr. Buckland." Even papers on natural history seem to have a delicacy in meddling with him, on account of his editorial and official standing, and his peculiar relation to a large part of the community interested in the popular aspects of the subject; while naturalists of admitted scientific reputa-

tion, in their respective branches, not regarding him as a reliable authority on the many questions on which he is so ready to give so absolute a decision, evidently will not enter the sphere of which he is the luminary. Having thus substantially a clear course before him, he acts as if he considered himself society's darling, that can do pretty much what he pleases in regard to natural history, and defy any moral magistrate—British and especially American—to commit him or bind him over. He rather went over the mark, however, in marring the sacred text of *White;* after which there is hardly anything for him to be guilty of but contempt of majesty and sacrilege.

The phrase "presumptuous inefficiency" applied by the *Examiner* to his edition of *White* is a bitter expression, and all the more bitter because the editor had apparently to decline using it in a formal impeachment of the writer by name. That purpose would have been served had I succeeded in getting part of the preceding article at page 191, from "In White's" to the end of it, with my name attached, inserted in a London journal which I always considered one of independence, and the special medium for pointing out the unpardonable liberties taken with *White.*

"Presumptuous inefficiency" is absolute truth when applied to Mr. Buckland's treatment of the viper question, where he has been caught, as it were, in a trap from which there is no living extrication; so that no one need look to him, even after his thirty years' labour, to have that very interesting point in natural history decided; and about which there need be no controversy, international or otherwise. Besides *vipers* swallowing their young, I repeat what I have said in the work:—

"I lay it down as an axiom that we must hold that *all* snakes [when living in a state of nature] swallow their young, till the opposite can be proved of any particular species of them" (p. 29).

On paying a visit this year (1878), about the 7th of April, to Weehawken, near Hoboken, in New Jersey, opposite New York, where snakes have been killed by the railroad trains passing over them while lying along or on the rails, for the heat of the sun concentrated in the iron (p. 29), I noticed, here and there, dead garter snakes of all sizes, lying sometimes three together, too fresh-looking to have been killed last year; and I made inquiries of a man in the immediate vicinity, who has mowed the marsh there for many years. He said that they made their first appearance in the early part of March—so early and mild was the season—and in great force about the 1st of April, when the children and more grown-up people turned out and killed many of them, some in the open air and others on turning over the stones to get at them. This man, intelligent and doubtless in this matter reliable, after having had many opportunities for noticing snakes, assured me, on being asked generally, "what he knew about snakes," that he had seen a black and a garter snake (both oviparous) swallow their young. He was minute in his description in the latter instance. He said that he saw the snake at a very short distance, then distinctly heard a peculiar noise, and saw her open widely her mouth, and the young snakes, coming quickly from every direction, and in a confused-looking scramble, enter it; making a scene very interesting to witness. He then put his foot on her, immediately below the head, just as the last one went down her throat, and seized her by the tail, and ripped her open with his knife, without touching the stomach proper, and let out a number of young ones, which were several weeks old, so far as he could judge. He said that the peculiar noise served the

purpose of that of a hen when she calls her chickens around her; but he could not imitate it, or even describe it beyond saying that the old snake *spoke* to her progeny.

This but illustrates what I have said at page 17, that

"More could be collected from intelligent people in or from country places [in America, about snakes] than one would perhaps care to be troubled with;" and at page 26, in regard to them swallowing their young, that "the popular belief in America is that *snakes*, without regard to species, do it, while there are few neighbourhoods in which one, if not several people, cannot be easily found who can testify to it as a fact."

IV.—THE ENDOWMENT OF RESEARCH.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY, in an address at the opening of the Johns Hopkins University, at Baltimore, on the 12th of September, 1876, when alluding to the "endowment of research," said :—

"It is given to few to add to the store of knowledge, to strike new springs of thought, or shape new forms of beauty."

But he did not add that such, almost invariably, are, for a time at least, abused, or refused the slightest courtesy, when something has to give place to what is brought forward. It would take up too much room to give the philosophy of such a phenomenon at length; suffice it to say that one reason for it is the opposition, or the objection to discussion, on the part of those who have such things in their special keeping, and the consequent indifference, incredulity, or even aversion of those who look to them for light on the subjects treated.

One of these questions is the preservation of the Jews, which the Duke of Argyll, in his *Reign of Law*, attributes to a miracle or a special providence. On the face of it one would say that the Duke would *not* do any of the following things :—

1st, Maintain as true what he does not believe to be so; 2d, advance as truth what he does not know to be fact or fable; 3d, maintain a personal or popular dogma as a truth until the contrary is demonstrated; 4th, refuse to acknowledge that any position taken up by him is unsound on its being proved to be so, or that there is no reasonable foundation for it; and 5th, allow his opinion to influence others on any subject he may have maintained, after it has been proved to be fallacious.

After completely refuting, I think, all that the Duke advanced on that subject, I said :—

"The fact of the Jews keeping distinct from others is a simple question, that is easily understood when investigated inductively and on its merits. It is neither miraculous, a special providence, wonderful, nor remarkable" (p. 163). "I have discussed the subject pretty fully in the work, showing that the existence of the Jews since the dispersion is in exact harmony with every natural law, and that it would have been a miracle had they ceased to be Jews, and become anything else than what they are to-day; and that there is no analogy between their history and that of any European nation" (p. 161). And that "nothing having the decent appearance of an argument can be advanced in support of such a theory" (p. 164,) as is generally held on this subject.

In my *Disquisition on the Gipsies* I have said that

"Writers on the Christian Evidences should content themselves with maintaining that the Jews have fulfilled the prophecies, and will yet fulfill them, and

assert nothing further of them," (p. 459).

In expatiating on the difficulties attending the "endowment of research," Professor Huxley, on the occasion mentioned, while discouraging the vulgar expedient of offering money for it, said nothing of extending to it the courtesy of discussion through the ordinary channels, doubtless for the reason that that aspect of the question was not specially before the meeting.

Another subject requiring to be "brought into more prominent notice than ordinary, when the publications devoted to it decline or delay doing it," as I wrote in the *Spectator*, on the 26th of August, 1876, with reference to Mr. Frank Buckland and the viper, is that of the Gipsies, a race that has existed in Great Britain for upwards of three centuries and a half, and about which I have said :—

"I admit that the subject of the Gipsies, so far as it is understood, and as *Blackwood* will have, or will allow, it to be understood, presents little interest to the world, if it means only *a certain style of life* that may *cease at any moment*," (p. 153).

The real interest, in the higher sense of the word, attaching to this people is centred in the relation in which it "stands to others around it, with reference to intermarriage and the destiny of the mixed progeny, and that of the tribe generally" (p. 135), especially in English-speaking countries.

In an appeal which I made to the Scottish Clergy on this subject, I said :—

"You thus see that the subject becomes one of disinterested and serious inquiry, in which there should be shown none of that apathy and contempt, and unreflecting incredulity, that is generally manifested, and is so unworthy of the age in which we live, and especially of men of education, and social and official standing in society," (p. 151).

I find that the great "bar in the way" of this subject being investigated is Mr. George Borrow, for people say that if there is anything of the nature mentioned in it, he must have found it and told us of it, as it has been in *his* "special keeping" for many years. In that respect I have said :—

"What becomes of the Gipsies, is a question that cannot be settled by reference to any of Mr. Borrow's writings, although these contain a few incidental remarks that throw some light on it, when information of a positive and circumstantial nature is added," (p. 120).

In his *Gipsies in Spain* he wrote :—

"We have already expressed our belief that the caste has diminished of latter years; whether this diminution was the result of one or many causes combined—of a partial change of habits, of pestilence or sickness, of war or famine, or of a freer intercourse with the Spanish population—we have no means of determining, and shall abstain from offering conjectures on the subject," (p. 126).

And in his *Romano Lavo-Lil* he said :—

"There is every reason to suppose that within a few years the English Gipsy caste will have disappeared, merged in the dregs of the English population," (p. 131).

This last remark, as he admits, is a mere supposition, based on nothing of the nature of a research, and contradicted by every fact or circumstance bearing on the subject mentioned in his writings.

Mr. Borrow has never been regarded as an accurate investigator and reasoner, possessing the comprehensiveness and judicial calmness of a philosopher, or as showing solidity of judgment in any question treated by him. He has had many

opportunities for examining his favourite subject, in the aspects of its ethnological, social, and historical development, in reply to what I wrote in the *History of the Gipsies*, published in London, in 1865, and in New York, in 1866, and in *Contributions* under consideration; and never having made any sign in connexion with either, he cannot complain if he is now counted out and shelved without ceremony. And yet I find one of his recruits writing of him, in a London journal, as follows :—

"We can stand all this pretty well, but we are up in arms when George Borrow . . . . is taken to task in a cold-blooded manner for all sorts of misleading statements, and is proved to be altogether an incompetent and ignorant guide on the subject. This is too much for our equanimity, and we honestly confess that we are weak enough to prefer George Borrow's stories to Mr. Simson's arguments." And like that of a *raw* recruit, his parting shot is—"In short, the world is full of blockheads; but there is one wise man left, and his name is Simson."

Indeed, George Borrow, Frank Buckland, and Charles Waterton may be described, without offence, as three impulsive, headstrong, ex-cathedrâ-talking dogmatists, incapable, when left to themselves, of constructing an argument of a complex nature, or of giving a satisfactory exposition of an intricate subject that could stand scrutiny. To train a thirteen-inch bomb on them, in that respect, would be superfluous, for a thimbleful of "sparrow-hail" would suffice. The judicious use of that "little crooked thing which asks questions," called an interrogatory, would dispose of much that has been advanced by all of them.

Of the Gipsy tribe, mixed as it is in regard to blood, and large in point of numbers, that is to be found pretty much everywhere, in many positions of life, from a tinker upwards, with the character and frequently the appearance of ordinary natives of the soil, I have said that its perpetuity is based on the

"Simple ground that they are the children or descendants of ordinary Gipsies, having their blood, an inherent sense of being members of the tribe, and some of the language and signs peculiar to themselves, like a Masonic society, although the possession of these words and signs is not absolutely necessary to constitute them Gipsies; for the mere consciousness of the fact of being Gipsies, transmitted from generation to generation, and made the basis of marriages and the intimate associations of life, is in itself perfectly sufficient," (p. 152).

That this people should be openly acknowledged by the rest of the population, and "treated on their individual merits as ordinarily recognized by society," and allowed to "form themselves into societies for such purposes as the world recognizes," may well be considered the subject of a "research"—conducted by the labour and at the expense of him making it—that stands in no need of an "endowment," but merits the attention of a variety of classes too numerous to mention, provided that it is carefully studied, and has a corresponding interest created for it.

The pride which the Gipsies have in their peculiar sept, their exclusive and secretive characteristics, which are inherent in them, and their natural resentment of the prejudice existing against the name and race, have made an amalgamation with the natives almost impossible, unless these become incorporated with them, whatever their habits or positions in life; and an absolute silence is observed on the subject of their nationality or society with outsiders, even in many cases Gipsies being afraid of being known as such to other Gipsies. The consequence is, that as the race perpetuates itself and develops its condition, it maintains such a reserve in regard to it-

self, that its members, as it were, or in a sense, "skulk through life like thieves, conspirators, or assassins, afraid of being apprehended by all they meet with," in the event of these coming to learn all about them, however good their characters may be.

When one has a doubt about the spelling of a word he writes it variously, one under the other, and generally picks out the correct one. In the same way let him attempt arguments in favour of the native and Gipsy hypotheses as regards John Bunyan's nationality, and all he can say of the former will be something like the trifling remarks to be found in *Blackwood's Magazine* for May, 1866, in which it is said:—

"John Bunyan was so exceedingly plain-spoken, that he would most likely have called himself a Gipsy if he were really one," (p. 158).

In my *Disquisition on the Gipsies*, I wrote:—

"I do not ask for an argument in favour of Bunyan not being a Gipsy, but a common Englishman, for an argument of that kind, beyond such remarks as I have commented on, is impracticable; but what I ask for is an exposition of the animus of the man who does not wish that he should have been a Gipsy," (p. 514).

It is a law in literature, indeed it is common-sense, that if nothing can be said in favour of one of two hypotheses, and everything in favour of the other, the latter must be accepted as the truth; and this we have in the one that Bunyan was a Gipsy. All that is wanting to change the hypothesis into a fact would be Bunyan's verbal acknowledgment, which the legal and social proscription of the race and name would prevent him making, and which strengthens the Gipsy hypothesis as such; so that if we have not his *formal* confession, we have his *inferential* admission, as *circumstantial* evidence, which is better than assertions either way, when a man's estate, character, or life is at stake.

That Bunyan was a member of the Gipsy tribe, doubtless speaking its language in great purity, is what, I think, no one that has a regard to reason and self-respect should deny, after the evidence is laid before him. The principal difficulties in the way of receiving him as a Gipsy are the prejudice against the name, and the aversion, as well as the great difficulty, however willing, inherent in human nature, to adjust its ideas to a new state of things on a subject that should have been settled two centuries ago. In that respect it is to be hoped that men of such standing as the Duke of Bedford and the Dean of Westminster, who have taken so much interest in Bunyan, will not prove "capable of being influenced by other motives than a regard for the evidence, in coming to a decision on the important matter at issue" (p. 161). Such a state of mind might be looked for in that part of society who take their opinions from others, or follow their caprices or passions when anything that is novel, and opposed to popular ideas and prejudices, is brought forward, and who are forever shutting their stable doors after their horses have been stolen.

In the *History of the Gipsies* an elaborate argument was given in favour of John Bunyan having been a Gipsy, with full information of how and when the race assumed the names common to the natives of the soil. I repeated the argument in *Contributions*, and again in *Notes and Queries*, on the 3d of March, 1875, and printed the article as an appendix to the book (which see), in reply to *The Book of the Bunyan Festival* and the *Sunday Magazine* for January, 1875; in both of which there was a great flourish of trumpets over the discovery that there were people of the name of Bunyan (variously spelt) in Bed-

fordshire before the arrival of the Gipsies; which "effectually disposes of the supposition that the Bunyans were Gipsies," and which as "effectually disposes of the supposition" that there are Gipsies in the country at the present day, since they all, so far as I know, bear British names! I have seen no further allusion to the subject, nor indeed any reference, at any time, to the affirmative side of the question in the *Sunday Magazine*, although it has been furnished with all the evidence in regard to it. Indeed, two prominent Scotchmen, each controlling an organ, which should have entertained this question, have gone to their graves without apparently daring to look it in the face. How strange it is that "champions of the truth and standard-bearers of the Lord," that might lay their necks on the block, or go to the stake, for their religious professions and opinions, will yet (so far as I can judge) quail before Mrs. Grundy on being asked to entertain the question whether or not John Bunyan was a Gipsy! And yet in recognizing and discharging the duties incumbent on them in the service of their divine master, what could be more simple or elementary than to acknowledge people to be men, whatever the race they belong to, before attempting to make them Christians?

It would also be strange to have it said that, in the year 1878, the British press, religious or secular, would not tolerate the idea that John Bunyan was a Gipsy even to appear in its columns; and that people frowned upon or became fired with indignation at the bare mention of it, while they wondered that, if it were so, Bunyan should not have told us plainly of the fact, when it was odious to the rest of the population, and death by law, for being a Gipsy, and "felony without benefit of clergy" for associating with the race, or even being found in its company. In *Contributions* I have said:—

"In mentioning that much of himself which he did, Bunyan doubtless imagined that the world understood, or would have understood, what he meant, and would, sooner or later, acknowledge the race to which he belonged;" and that, "it is not impossible that people intimate with Bunyan learned from his own mouth that he was a Gipsy, but suppressed the information under the influence of the unfortunate prejudice that exists against the name" (p. 158).*

Settling this question in the affirmative would resemble a decision in a supreme court of justice in a case that is representative of many others; and could not fail to have an immense influence on the raising up of the Gipsy tribe, to which Bunyan belonged.

I have said that subjects that are capable of proof "should be settled by evidence as a fact is proved in a court of justice; difficulties, suppositions, or theories not being allowed to form part of the testimony" (p. 28), whether that evidence is positive, or circumstantial, or mixed. How would it look if it were maintained that *any* question should be decided by *any one*, or by any number of people, in the negative, by the mere assertion of its belief in its non-existence, without any investigation, rather than by evidence being led to prove the affirmative? And yet many people, of whom better things could be expected, especially in regard to crude popular beliefs, of long standing, but not religious in their nature, practically maintain, with the most complacent assurance and sincerity, the negative unless the affirmative

* "In order to discover truth, we must be truthful ourselves, and must welcome those who point out our errors as heartily as those who approve and confirm our discoveries."—*Max Müller, "Chips from a German Workshop," 1st vol., p. 16, New York edition.*

can be proved, or *vice versâ;* which is no proof of, and does not even affect, the question either way; for the negative or the affirmative may be true, irrespective of the ignorance and denial, or the knowledge and assertion, of people interesting themselves in the questions at issue. These are all doubtless truisms, but although truisms not the less worthy of being kept in mind when we treat any subject of which the mind can or does take cognizance.

Nor could it be almost imagined that, in a constitutional country, in time of peace, with the courts in full operation, any question that is actionable should be denied even a hearing by a competent court, on the plea of favouring the defendant, or on account of the absence of the plaintiff (provided he employs an accredited attorney, and gives security for costs), or to gratify popular prejudices against a suit that is legal and moral in its nature. The same may be said of the laws and courts of *criticism*, for if they are in a sound state they will at once entertain, discuss, and settle any and every question suitable to the journal before which it is brought. It is unquestionably within their sphere to entertain *demurrers*, and see that they are respected, to the extent at least that no one can be allowed to make assertions, and assertions only, after they have been repeatedly denied, with proofs of denial, or arguments showing them to be untenable, or highly improbable. They should also see that no denial or assertion is permitted unless it is accompanied by evidence, or an argument in its favour.

As illustrative of what I mean by *demurrers*, I give the article entitled *Mr. Frank Buckland on English Snakes*, in which he said:—

"The mother generally deposits them [her eggs] in a dung-hill or heap of decaying vegetable matter, and gives herself no more concern about them," (p. 31).

To which my reply read thus:—

"It would be interesting to know how Mr. Buckland arrived at that conclusion, that is, how he knew that the mother 'gave herself no more concern about them,' but left the young to come into the world and take care of themselves in the best way they could," (p. 31).

And I argued, inductively and by analogy from the habit of *other oviparous reptilia* taking care of their progeny, that what Mr. Buckland asserted was not true; leaving him to make good his assertion by proof, positive or otherwise.

If it is wrong to believe that to be a truth which has never been investigated, it becomes culpable to enunciate it as such. No intelligent and self-respecting man will ever be knowingly and deliberately guilty of that, and far less of denying that to be a fact which he does not know to be a fact or not, or act factiously in the matter. Indeed it may be asserted that such a person has no moral right, not merely to publicly or privately express an opinion on a great variety of subjects, but even to entertain one, unless he has thoroughly examined them, or had it done for him, when the most that he might be justified in saying would be that such a thing is possible or impossible, probable or improbable, and be willing and ready to give his reasons at length for his opinion, whatever it might be. Candour, in short, is so eminently a virtue, that it might have been worshipped (as it doubtless was) in heathen times, as a deity, having a temple in every parish, and a shrine at every cross-road, with the notice:—"No dogmatist allowed here."

With so much that is aggressive in this Appendix, and in the work to which it belongs, and consequently with so much that must be

more or less offensive, and unavoidably so, to many, although I hope not to all, however the subjects might be treated, for "it is impossible but that offences will come," I feel that in publishing them in Great Britain, I must, in some respects, resemble (but resemble only) "a desperate adventurer landing on a coast, and burning his ships, and committing himself to fortune," and of whom it could be most appropriately said:—

"Woe to the coward, that ever he was born,
Who did not draw the sword before he blew the horn."

Still, in England, there is that sense of dignity and honourable dealing among high-class, high-toned journals, that if they do not entertain or do justice to the book (or rather to the subjects discussed in it), they will not abuse it. And, besides that, there is a strong conservative feeling peculiar to most of them that impels them to be careful in regard to what they introduce to their readers; which is a great drawback to anything novel or original, whatever its truth or attraction, being given to the world through their pages. But as all of the subjects treated are of a permanent nature and interest, the work can wait till it suits the convenience or pleasure of these journals to take it up, after it has become more conventional to do so than seems to be the case at present. As regards myself personally, I have no requests to make of any kind, for even the commonest "rough" there, when a stranger gets into trouble, will generally call for "a ring and fair play."

In this light read the accompanying notice of the book by the Edinburgh *Scotsman*, the leading Scotch newspaper, whose character would be the following, if I were describing a man in every-day life:—that is, well-educated, talented, enterprising, not over-scrupulous, and wealthy, very tyrannical by nature, and of great personal importance, but of no family, pedigree, or connexions worth speaking of, yet whose motto is, "A fig for providence, but come to me!"

He is a great professor of humanity, liberalism, science, and so forth, and the patron and mouthpiece of a large "promiscuous lot" in regard to their opinions and interests (many of which are questionable), and undefined and almost undefinable religious sentiments; and is very free, even tyrannically so, in his unprovoked remarks on almost all that differ from him, or are not of his "following," generally to an extent of being uncalled for, indelicate or impertinent, and frequently nearly if not altogether scurrilous—amplifying and harping on subjects and persons till his spun-out questionable wit and palpable animus become tiresome and offensive even to those who generally regard him as an oracle. Moreover, he is "a godless old fellow withal," to whom anything like sincere practical religion, based on the Christian evidences, with clearly-defined ideas, when publicly expressed outside of the regular church service, is generally offensive, and frequently provocative of all kinds of bantering, jeering, and gibing. My allusions to the Pope and John Stuart Mill, and the aspects of natural and revealed religion, incidentally brought in, and, above all, the public appeal to the Scottish Clergy, seem to have acted on him like the shaking of a red rag in his face, and become a subject to be discredited, if not destroyed. Indeed, if one takes even an Ishmaelitish squint in the direction of the Ark in daylight, he has to reckon with another whose eyes are globules of water and who lacks bowels for such a subject—an excellent "defender of the faith" against its unauthorized or injudicious friends.

Many sensible, learned, and pious, and what are called good men (and many not possessed of all of these

attributes), who are entitled to promulgate their opinions, and be fairly treated or "let alone," have been little better than systematically persecuted—frequently almost roasted or blistered—or attempted to be made odious by the "Scottish Thunderer," as his admirers style him, apparently with the object of giving pleasure to himself and friends, and pain to those so treated. Pious and peaceable people, possessing a fine sense of self-respect, deeming it unbecoming, at least unprofitable, to bandy words with him, or lay themselves open to his animadversions, to a great extent disregard him, especially when the fit of "fractious contrariness" is upon him, for the reason that they consider "his tongue no scandal;" and so far as I know or can conceive, they will not even pray for him, that he may be converted or rebuked, believing that, in "the present state of his soul," any good person or cause that he abuses is greatly honoured and ultimately benefited by his hostility, however influential he may be, in the estimation of himself and friends, in the affairs of the city, the nation, and the world at large—although generally, passively or actively, opposed, even factiously so, to almost every movement, whatever its nature, that does not originate with him, his friends, or his party, or that does not seek or care for, and particularly that scorns their patronage or sympathy.

A book like the present one, finding its way to Edinburgh from America, under the peculiar circumstances of this one—a thing of rare occurrence in Scotland—was entitled to some little consideration from even such a journal as the *Scotsman*. It does not seem to have come before the celebrated *Jeffrey*, who, when acting under a high sense of responsibility, would doubtless have approached it as a careful, cautious man would have acted when picking his steps in dim twilight, among broken glass and rusty nails, barefooted, with the consciousness of having a ruffian waiting to throttle him as he got through. It rather had the misfortune of "coming under the eye" of the notorious *Jeffreys*, alluded to by Macaulay in his *History of England*, as follows:—

"Early in June the Fellows [of Magdalene College] were cited to appear before the High Commission at Whitehall. Five of them, deputed by the rest, obeyed the summons. Jeffreys treated them after the usual fashion. When one of them, a grave doctor, named Fairfax, hinted some doubt as to the validity of the commission, the Chancellor began to roar like a wild beast. 'Who is this man? What commission has he to be impudent here? Seize him. Put him into a dark room. What does he do without a keeper? He is under my care as a lunatic. I wonder that nobody has applied to me for the custody of him.'"

With what I have said, illustrative of the "habit and repute" character of the critic, or rather of the journal which he represents, I will now "let the man speak for himself," remarking that I would much rather swaddle a person in swan's-down and cover him with gossamer, or fan him to keep the life in him, than put him into a vise and rasp him, but for the principle propounded or admitted even, I believe, by a Quaker, that "We must not allow silly pity to rob justice of her due and the people of a proper example," especially with such an "old offender" as the *Scotsman*,—the Great Liberal! of whom it could or could not be said that "aiblins he'll mend."

"What may be the ordinary calling of Mr. James Simson, of New York, is not known to us; but to judge from this volume of *Contributions to Natural History, etc.*, his mission is to set everybody else right with respect to the habits of snakes, the abilities as a naturalist of the late Charles Waterton, the errors of Romanism, the real character of John Stuart Mill and his father, James Mill, and the manners and customs of the Gipsies. The papers included in the volume are in part reprinted from *Land*

and Water; others were sent for insertion in that periodical, but its conductors had too much discretion to insert them [they were politely 'returned by request,' as stated in the Introduction to the work]; the rest have been added as the result of labours undertaken in time during which it is a great pity Mr. Simson could find nothing better to do. : . . He accumulates a mass of evidence to prove that young snakes are in the habit, after being hatched outside, of taking refuge inside their parents' bodies on very small provocation; but this evidence it would be found very difficult to sift or test, and the impertinent dogmatism with which Mr. Simson treats Buckland, White of Selborne, and other naturalists who do not favour his views, is, of itself, sufficient to warrant a doubt as to the value of his observations. Mr. Simson's remarks on Waterton, and especially on Mill, are neither more nor less than a string of absurd and pointless criticisms, interspersed with a considerable amount of personal abuse. The puzzle is, why he should suppose that his views on Waterton and Mill are of the smallest importance to any human being except himself. The volume is altogether a literary curiosity, presenting a combination of bigotry and egotism such as it would not be easy to parallel." (June 10th, 1875).

In regard to James Mill, the father of John Stuart Mill, I have said that

"It was after finally breaking with the Church, perhaps in consequence of disappointment of a benefice, and of the restraint on his godless opinions, that he gave vent to all his spitefulness against religion of every kind, natural as well as revealed" (p. 71).

In his *Life of James Mill*, in *Mind*, a London quarterly review, Professor Bain says of him:—

"The latest recorded incident of his career in Scotland is his being defeated in his attempt to become minister of the pleasant parish of Craig, a long narrow strip of uplands lying on the coast between Montrose and the Bay of Lunan. Mill could have taken care of such a parish [as parishes were then frequently 'taken care of'], and yet have found time for his favourite studies, working his way to authorship, and perhaps a chair in a university" (p. 115).

Powerful as was his influence, that of his rival, James Brewster (a brother of Sir David Brewster), was more so. It is added:—"Brewster was a man far more acceptable to an ordinary congregation than ever Mill could have been."

Professor Bain says that the popular idea of Mill's disappointment being the cause of his going to London, in the beginning of 1802, was a mere guess, for with his friends he would soon have found a church. But no allowance is made for his chagrin, his hasty temper, or the delay (nearly eighteen months) till the case was settled, after the resignation of the incumbent, in June, 1803, under circumstances which are not explained. We find Mill writing from London, on the 7th of February, 1807, to Mr. David Barclay, as follows:—

"Have you no good kirk yet in your neighbourhood [as if he had given him a standing commission from the first to find him one] which you could give me, and free me from this life of toil and anxiety which I lead here?" (p. 530).*

It was doubtless with this in view that he carefully kept his sermons, about which Professor Bain says:—

"I cannot account for John Stuart Mill's uncertainty as to whether his father had been licensed to preach. I have been told by members of the family that their father's sermons were known to be in the house. What became of them no one can tell" (p. 111). (Perhaps they were surreptitiously destroyed).

This remark has reference to his

* There is nothing to show that James Mill did not write to others to the same effect, even subsequently to the time mentioned, particularly as Professor Bain says that, "with his friends he would soon have found a church."

inquiry addressed to Mr. Barclay in regard to his father, after his death, in which he said:—

"I believe he went through a medical course, and also that for the Church, and I have heard that he was actually licensed as a preacher, but I never heard him say so himself, and never heard of it till after his death. I do not know whether it is true or not; perhaps you do" (p. 104).*

Professor Bain writes:—

"The account given by John Stuart Mill *(Autobiography)* of his father's introduction to the Fettercairn family is a somewhat loose version of the statement made to him by Mr. David Barclay in a letter written after his father's death in 1836" (p. 104).

His father's "apostolic labours," after being licensed by the Presbytery to "preach the gospel of Jesus Christ," seem to have been anything but acceptable. The evidence shows that

"The generality of the hearers complained of not being able to understand him. Other traditions concur in regard to his unpopular style. Sir David Brewster said to myself, 'I have heard him preach; and no great han' he made o't.' His discourses would no doubt be severely reasoned, but wanting in the unction of the popular evangelical preacher" [who sincerely believed what he taught] (p. 111).

James Mill was born on the 6th of April, 1773, went to college at Edinburgh in 1790, was licensed as a preacher on the 4th of October, 1798, and went to London in the beginning of 1802, after being disappointed in getting a church. On the 7th of February, 1807, when 34 years of age, and nearly a year after the birth of John Stuart Mill, we find him, as we have seen, writing to a friend in Scotland, asking him *if he had not yet found him a good kirk* in his neighbourhood. What John Stuart Mill said with reference to his father's religious history is as follows:—

"He . . . . . was licensed as a preacher, but never followed the profession, having satisfied himself that he could not believe the doctrines of that or any other church" (p. 69, *Auto.* p. 3), having "been early led to reject not only the belief in Revelation, but the foundations of what is commonly called Natural Religion" (p. 69, *Auto.* p. 38). He "rejected all that is called religious belief" (p. 73, *Auto.* p. 39). "He regarded it with the feeling due not to a mere mental delusion, but to a great moral evil. He looked upon it as the greatest enemy to morality," and as "radically vitiating the standard of morals" (p. 73, *Auto.* p. 40), and "not only false, but hurtful" (p. 76, *Auto.* p. 45); and that "the most perfect conception of wickedness which the human mind can devise" is "embodied in what is commonly presented to mankind as the creed of Christianity" (p. 76, *Auto.* p. 41).

Here we have a dismal chasm to be bridged, for no value can be attached to John Stuart Mill's remarks on this subject. I have already said:—

* The ignorance of John Stuart Mill on this point, however we may look at it, is remarkable. It must surely have occurred to him to ask his father, for what purpose he went to college, if not when receiving his education from him personally, at least after he grew up. And the idea would again naturally present itself to him when being instructed in the irreligious principles impressed on his mind almost from his earliest recollections. Mill by his admission seems to have had very little curiosity about his father's early history, or no means of information on the subject from his father's early Scotch associates or connexions, or acquaintances of any kind; yet it must have been well known to the public at large, owing to his notoriety, that James Mill was a "stickit stibbler," as the Scotch call a "minister" who never finds a church and abandons the profession in consequence. The reticence of James Mill, under certain circumstances, was natural enough, but inconsistent with his allowing his sermons to "knock about" the house, to the knowledge of "members of the family," John Stuart Mill excepted.

"There is so much in the Autobiography that is so illy arranged, and so loosely and illogically put together, that among other things, the positive truth cannot be drawn from it in regard to the stages of the elder Mill's religious ideas; and there is much that requires explanation about him consenting to be educated by others for the Church, and being licensed to preach at the age of twenty-five, and then becoming a practical atheist" (p. 69). "The circumstances and details between the first doubt and the final step, had he been able and willing to give them, would doubtless have been interesting" (p. 70).

And yet John Stuart Mill says of his father that

"He will be known to posterity as one of the greatest names in that most important branch of speculation on which all the moral [?] and political sciences ultimately rest" (p. 108, *Auto.* p. 204); and that "by his writings and his personal influence he was a great centre of light to his generation" (p. 108, *Auto.* p. 205).

The course of the elder Mill in the matter of seeking a church—a position that, above all others, should be assumed with "clean hands and a pure heart"—was a practical, one-sided illustration of his doctrine, that "the exclusive test of right and wrong [is] the tendency of actions to produce pleasure or pain" (*Auto.*, p. 48), that is, pleasure to himself and his immediate connexions, however it might be acquired, and however it might affect others. Utility as "a standard in ethics and politics," when its professed motive is the benefit of "the aggregate of our fellow creatures," or "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," should not be scrutinized too closely when the animus is hid from us; but it assumes quite a different aspect when the action is that of a would-be moral obtruder on a parish and the "cure of souls" that are to be fed, not on "the gospel of Jesus Christ," but on the husks of his philosophy and logic, which the generality or perhaps the whole of "his people" would not understand. And it would be a singular "system of morals" which advocated or tolerated the idea that, while not believing the doctrines on the sworn profession of which he was admitted to his "pastorate," he should "take care of the parish," with the ulterior object of "working his way to authorship, and perhaps a chair in a university," on something better than "a little oatmeal," although that would of course make part of his support.

The history of both of the Mills, especially in regard to the religious ideas, from first to last, of James Mill, as representing a class, is well worthy of a "research." It must have been a difficult matter for the latter to throw off the effects of his associations and training, and his *long-continued* aspirations after a church, whatever the "history of his mind" or his sincerity might have been. At all events we find him, in October, 1816, when John Stuart Mill was upwards of ten years old, writing of his *History of India* as follows:—

"Thank God, after nearly ten years since its commencement, I am now revising it for the press" *(Bain)*. *

The executors of John Stuart Mill have been greatly blamed for publishing his melancholy and offensive Autobiography, but doubtless unjustly so; for, for what purpose was it written? and how do we know that he did not enjoin on them by all which *he* deemed sacred that they would not fail to give it to the world?

The subjects of John Stuart Mill and Romanism are naturally provo-

* I have not been able to see more than the first two articles of Professor Bain, in *Mind*, but I presume the rest of them will shed no further light on James Mill's religious ideas.

cative of something more being said on that comprehensive idea expressed by the phrase "human nature," in its physical, moral, and religious aspects, as applicable to man individually and collectively, in the past, the present, and the future; but it would result in a treatise, branching off into many cognate questions, that would be too long to form part of this Appendix, and contain matter perhaps too foreign to be embraced under the title.

NOTE.—I find that, at page 51, I have put into the mouth of Plato the prayer beginning, "O Pan, and ye other gods of this place," while it was that of Socrates—the "wisest of mankind"—as reported by Plato. The error is not material, for such a prayer was addressed to Pan, in common with all the so-called gods and goddesses, by the ancient heathen.